

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXI. OCTOBER 1890.

ART. I.—THE UNRECORDED SAYINGS OF
OUR LORD.

1. *Agapha: aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente in möglicher Vollständigkeit zusammengestellt und quellenkritisch untersucht von ALFRED RESCH.* In Gebhardt und Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band v. Heft 4. (Leipzig, 1889.)
2. *Das Hebräer-Evangelium: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kritik des hebräischen Matthäus.* Von RUDOLPH HANDMANN. In *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Band v. Heft 2. (Leipzig, 1889.)

WE are expressly told by St. John that besides the things which he has recorded in his Gospel there were many other things which Jesus had said and done (xxi. 25). Even if this Evangelist had not so emphatically stated it, our own common sense would convince us that it was, in the nature of things, impossible that an absolutely complete record should have been given of everything which our Blessed Lord had said and done during the years of His earthly life. We may be assured, then, that the other three Evangelists as well as the fourth aimed at no more than to make a selection of those of our Lord's words and deeds which they judged it most important that the Church should possess. We may be quite sure that they have told us all that it was essential for us to know—quite enough to attain what St. John declares to have been his object, namely, 'that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through His name' (xx. 31).

Yet the more lively our sense of the inestimable value of what has been given us the more natural it is that we should hunger for more. We ask ourselves, Can nothing be added to that biography of our Lord which has been given us in the Gospels? The harvest no doubt was well reaped by the

VOL. XXXI.—NO. LXI.

B

370634

four Evangelists; but are we forbidden to think that they may have left behind some materials for a gleaner? We have one striking proof that they did not include in their Gospels every saying of our Lord which it had been in their power to record; for St. Luke, in the Acts, has added one which neither he nor any of the other Evangelists had included in his Gospel, and *that* one of the most precious of the gracious words that proceeded from our Lord's mouth: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive' (xx. 35).

It surely seems a thing not to be pronounced impossible that some trustworthy historical tradition might be obtained to supplement what inspired pens have recorded. Our Saviour lived a public life; eager multitudes thronged Him, hoping to benefit by His healing power, or desiring to be instructed by His teaching. For example, St. Matthew tells us in general terms (ix. 35), 'Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.' Is it unlikely that the grateful recollection of some of those on whom these works of healing had been done should preserve the details of their cure, or that among His hearers in the synagogue there should be some who would store up in their memory the words of Him who spoke as never man spake? It would, therefore, be not unnatural if, in addition to those traditions of our Lord's life and teaching, the authenticity of which was guaranteed by inspired Evangelists, we had also others, not so well attested yet by no means to be summarily rejected. The probability of the existence of such uncanonical traditions rises higher when we learn that at a very early period traditions of the kind not only circulated from mouth to mouth, but were committed to writing. So St. Luke tells us in his preface, from which we learn that before he wrote his Gospel, already 'many had taken in hand' to draw up a narrative of the events of the Saviour's life.

It is notorious that there are now extant non-canonical Gospels, one at least of which can claim a very early date, amongst which it might have been hoped we should recover a pre-canonical Gospel, or at least some fragments of such a Gospel. But critics of all schools are agreed that nothing valuable of the kind is to be found in these extant Gospels, concerning the character of which the name apocryphal, by which they are generally known, conveys no false impression. They are all later, some of them much later, than the canonical Gospels; and whatever original matter they contain has all the marks of being pure invention.

crit
can
larg
clos
sug
or t
crit
Eva
Gos
sup
of
sho
not
trad
fav
the
ing
use
hav
this
reg
pos
wha
thes
in t
in o
do n
clus

and
of t
from
occa
spok
thos
pret
amp
alm
us t
our
were
prec
poss
of th

Yet it has been thought not impossible to recover by critical enquiry some fragments at least of predecessors of the canonical Gospels. On comparison of the synoptic Gospels large portions are found common to all three, agreeing so closely, not only in sense but in form of expression, as to suggest that either one Evangelist copied the work of another or that all drew from a common source. Now the current of critical opinion is decidedly adverse to the notion that one Evangelist copied another. Certainly, at least as far as the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke are concerned, if we suppose that either Evangelist was acquainted with the work of the other, we find it almost impossible to explain why he should have omitted so much useful for his purpose, to say nothing of a multitude of variations or even apparent contradictions. The hypothesis has, therefore, found considerable favour that before any of our existing Gospels was composed the apostolical tradition concerning our Lord's life and teaching had already assumed some written form which was made use of independently by our Evangelists. Various attempts have been made by the help of our present Gospels to restore this, which, if the hypothesis be correct, would deserve to be regarded as the earliest of all the Gospels. It is not our purpose in this article to enter into so large a subject as to discuss what measure of success, if any, has been obtained in any of these speculations. It is evident that if they were successful in the highest degree they would do no more than mark out in our existing Gospels some specially ancient part, and would do nothing to *supplement* the fourfold narrative on which exclusively the investigation rests.

We must look, then, for information to uninspired sources; and though these add nothing trustworthy to our knowledge of the incidents of our Lord's life, yet what can be gleaned from them as to His sayings is not hastily to be rejected. We occasionally find in early writers words quoted as having been spoken by our Lord which we cannot identify with any of those recorded in the Gospels. Some of these sayings are pretty generally known to theological students, as, for example, 'Be ye approved money-changers.' The character of almost all these alleged sayings is such that nothing forbids us to believe that some such words may have been spoken by our Lord if only the evidence as to His having uttered them were good enough. The sayings of our Blessed Lord are so precious that it would be a welcome discovery if it were really possible to make any trustworthy supplement to that selection of them which is included in our Gospels. We feel the fitness

of the motto which Bishop Westcott has prefixed to his collection of these extra-canonical sayings—'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.' The collection in question is to be found as Appendix C, 'On the Apocryphal Traditions of the Lord's Words and Works,' added to Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, and is the fullest and most convenient collection of such traditions that had been made at the time of its publication. It is worth while to copy the little preface which Bishop Westcott prefixes to his collection.

'It is a fact of great significance that traditional accounts of words or works of the Lord which are not noticed in the Gospels are extremely rare. The Gospels are the full measure of what was known in the Apostolic age, and (may we not add?) of what was designed by Providence for the instruction of after ages. There are, however, some fragments which appear to contain true and original traits of the Lord's teaching, and as such are invested with the greatest interest. Some traditional sayings, again, are evidently duplicate recensions of passages contained in the Gospels. Others are so distorted by the admixture of explanation or comment as to present only a very narrow point of connexion with the Evangelic history' (p. 428, 3rd edit.).

We have indicated quotations of early writers as a source from which some additions to the inspired narrative may be obtained; we ought not to omit to name another—namely, various readings of early manuscripts. It is notorious that Codex D, for example, is full of additions to the canonical text. One of the best known examples, resting solely on the authority of that manuscript, is the story of the man working on the Sabbath, to whom our Lord is reported to have said, 'O man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and art a transgressor of the law.' Though Codex D is but a sixth-century manuscript yet its type of text is recognized as of much greater antiquity; and its uncanonical additions deserve attention as traditions concerning the Gospel history which circulated, in all probability, as early as the second century. Moreover the severity of modern criticism tends to transfer some few passages from the received text of the Gospels to the category of uninspired additions. Thus the story of the woman taken in adultery is now by common consent of critics rejected as being no part of the Gospel of St. John; yet, considered as an uncanonical addition, is recognized as having very high claims to respectful attention. Still more does this remark apply to some verses rejected by Westcott and Hort. Thus if the words,

'Fath
par
trad
of th
about
the c
—in
expu
tions
elsev
ther
ful c
well
ages
is a

T
revie
sayin
some
Bish
appe
Resc
an e
dicti
the s
whic
spea
to m
it w
coun
Epis
whic
the v
spirit
intro
comm
'Aw
Chris
comp
made
ment

1
(Stro
word
writte

'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' be no part of Luke's genuine text, we must own that uncanonical tradition was able to add to the Gospel history a supplement of the very highest value. Something similar may be said about the story of the bloody sweat, about our Lord's answer to the disciples who asked leave to call down fire from heaven—in short, about every text which modern critics propose to expunge from the *Textus Receptus*. Setting aside those additions to the Gospel history found in apocryphal Gospels or elsewhere, which may be dismissed as undoubtedly spurious, there is found a residuum of passages, uncanonical or of doubtful canonicity, whose claims to credibility on historic grounds well merit examination. To make a collection of such passages, and to discuss the evidence for the authenticity of each, is a work which deserves a welcome.

This is what is attempted in the work of Resch now under review, which is a systematic treatise on these extra-canonical sayings; and the author is naturally able, in a monograph of some 500 pages, to treat his subject with greater fullness than Bishop Westcott, for example, had been able to do in an appendix of nine pages added to another work. The title of Resch's book is *Agrapha*, a name which he has adopted from an earlier monograph on the same subject by Koerner, *De dictis Christi ἀγράφοις* (Leipzig, 1776). Resch gives much the same explanation of what he means by 'agrapha' as that which Roman Catholics give of what they mean when they speak of 'unwritten tradition,' the word ἀγραφα being taken to mean not so much 'unwritten'¹ as 'non-scriptural;' or it would be better to say 'extra-Evangelical,' for Resch counts among his *Agrapha* passages from the canonical Epistles, viz. the verse 1 Cor. ii. 9, 'Eye hath not seen,' &c., which St. Paul introduces with the formula 'as it is written;' the words which St. James (iv. 5) quotes as Scripture, 'The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy;' and the words introduced in the Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 14) with the common formula of Scripture quotation 'Wherefore he saith,' 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' Resch aims at making a more complete collection of 'agrapha' than any which had been made before, and has added a critical and exegetical commentary, discussing on external and internal grounds the

¹ In the passages which Resch refers to in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v. 7, p. 771; i. 10, p. 34) it appears to us that Clement uses the word ἀγράφοις in the strict sense, and is opposing purely oral tradition to written.

claims of each fragment to be regarded as authentic, and attempting to ascertain the meaning which the words were originally intended to convey. Resch has been successful in calling attention to some 'agrapha' which his predecessors had not noticed, and he deserves commendation for giving his authorities, not by mere reference but in full quotation, so that a reader is able to form some opinion of the validity of his arguments without the necessity in every case of turning to the originals of the passages quoted.

Nothing is harder than to report facts simply without mixing up the theoretical views of the reporter, and Resch's presentation of his facts is somewhat coloured by his theory as to the genesis of the Gospels. He has adopted the views of those who have inferred from words of Papias that the earliest Gospel was a collection made by Matthew in the Hebrew language of 'logia,' or sayings, of our Lord; that the next was St. Mark's Gospel, and that from these two sources our present Gospels of Matthew and Luke were derived. Thus he gives the name of 'logion' to each of the fragments which he collects, and he is only concerned with them as possible parts of the original Hebrew Gospel which he supposes to have been known to St. Paul and the other New Testament writers. He has nothing to say to apocryphal Gospels, which are all of later date than that which he tries to restore; if any of his fragments could be referred to the Gospel according to the Egyptians or any such source it would be outside the scope of his collection.

The ingenuity of Resch's combinations is often very attractive; but when his proofs are dispassionately tested there is a great shrinkage, and the peculiar part of his theory—namely, the attempt to find 'agrapha' in the New Testament—cannot be said to be successful. He appears to us not to have always resisted the temptation, to which collectors are liable, of undue eagerness to swell the bulk of his collection. In cases where there is room for doubt as to the right of a passage to be admitted, he is always disposed to decide in favour of the claimant. Thus it frequently happens that early writers quote as sayings of our Lord words differing only verbally or in trivial particulars from sayings recorded in our Gospels. It may be conceded that orthodox divines have sometimes been too hasty in assuming that every such instance is to be regarded as a case of quotation from the Gospels now extant, and that it is necessary to bear in mind the possibility that use may have been made of some Gospel now lost. But, considering the looseness of quotation habitual with early writers, and which is still common when citations are made

from
tha
sho
by
of
anc
our
san
be
Ep
ass
unl
had
qu
are
per
wh
not
wa
ten
qu
lin
pla
has
wh
to
suf
him
pre
in
Th
Cle
lea
cor
Ma
wri
wh
Pol
Ap
per
Cle
orig
Cle
Ep
Ap

from memory, and considering also the great improbability that a Gospel ever regarded by the Church as authoritative should be allowed completely to perish, we cannot be induced by verbal differences of quotation to believe in the existence of such a lost Gospel, unless these differences be considerable and persistent—that is to say, unless phrases not found in our extant text occur more than once in the quotations of the same or of different writers. Something of the same kind may be said when a Father quotes words now found in the Pauline Epistles as if they had been sayings of our Lord. Before we assume that the Father in question had access to some Gospel unknown to us, we should like to be assured that his memory had not merely played him false as to the source of his quotation. Again, when the quotations of different writers are compared it is essential to show that the writers are independent witnesses. Any argument founded on the form in which sayings of our Lord are given by an early writer gains nothing in strength from the fact that his form of quotation was copied by a later writer. Erroneous quotations have a tendency to propagate themselves. At the present day false quotations are current, not only of verses of Scripture, but of lines of Shakespeare and of other standard writers, the explanation of the currency being that words which quotation has once made familiar are apt to be repeated in the form in which they have been heard, and without any new reference to the original. Resch's treatment of his second 'logion' sufficiently illustrates the want of caution of which we accuse him. It is notorious that Clement of Rome (ch. 13) cites precepts of our Lord, in sense identical with those contained in St. Luke vi. 36–8, but differing in form of expression. Three different hypotheses may fairly be held: (*a*) that Clement knew these precepts by oral tradition; (*b*) that he learned them from St. Luke, whom he cites from memory, combining his words with those of parallel passages in Matthew; (*c*) that he learned them from some different written Gospel. But Resch builds a mere castle in the air when he puts together the citations of the same precepts by Polycarp, by Clement of Alexandria, by Macarius, and in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and their source, treating all as independent authorities, through combination of which with Clement of Rome and with St. Luke the Hebrew of the original Gospel may be recovered. Both Polycarp and Clement of Alexandria were intimately acquainted with the Epistle of the Roman Clement, as was also the editor of the *Apostolic Constitutions*; consequently coincidences on their

part with the Roman Clement's language have no significance whatever.

If the hypothesis is put forward of a primitive Apostolic Gospel, known to St. Paul and used by him, it is almost a necessity to assume that this Gospel was Aramaic. For if it had been in Greek, and regarded by that Apostle as authoritative, he would surely have made it known to the Churches which he founded; it must have remained with them in constant use, and could never have been superseded by modern rivals, much less have perished altogether. The only possible explanation of the loss of such a Gospel is that it was in a language with which the Churches where it was employed were not acquainted, and so was known to these Churches, not directly, but through the use made of it by Christian teachers of Hebrew extraction. Even so we are not free from difficulties. We should have thought it likely that if St. Paul was indebted to a Hebrew Gospel for his knowledge of the events of our Lord's life he would have taken care that this Gospel should be made known by translation to the Churches which he founded. We should have thought it certain that in Palestine at least this Gospel would have been exclusively used, and that there, if not elsewhere, a Greek version would have been made. Thus it seems to us that, though the hypothesis of a primitive Hebrew Gospel may be easily accepted, it is difficult to believe that the authorship of this Gospel was such as to place its authority above all competition. The framers of our extant Greek Gospels evidently regarded themselves as in possession of such independent information as put them above the necessity of making a mere translation of the Hebrew Gospel, and left them at liberty to modify it or supplement it by their fuller knowledge.

But here we have to take account of the fact that there is an actual claimant for the honour of having been the primitive Hebrew Gospel. It is known that an Aramaic Gospel was in early times in circulation which claimed Apostolic authority; by many it was ascribed to St. Matthew. This Gospel was known to Origen and to St. Jerome, who have preserved extracts from it enabling us to form some opinion as to its character; but the opinion of writers in respect to it is divided. The majority, including both those who favour and those who reject the views concerning the New Testament books traditional in the Christian Church, regard this Hebrew Gospel as of inferior authority and probably of later date than the extant canonical Gospels; nor does Resch accept

it as
other
versio
the m
Gree
and i
of wh
bids
of the
First
the p
recep
Aram
We h
as au
by th
show
Paul
sede
altog
we w
of w
Hebr
with
he th
high
it wa
them
super
he wa
had a
teach
more
was t
to let
ceiva
migh
tives
shoul
which

16
evang
gelium
terten
des U

it as the primitive Gospel of which he is in search.¹ On the other hand there is a minority which maintains that the version of our Lord's acts and words given in this Gospel bears the marks of superior antiquity to that presented in the Greek Gospel. This, for example, is the view of Hilgenfeld, and it is ably advocated in Handmann's monograph, the title of which we have prefixed to this article. Want of space forbids our including in this article a full discussion of the claims of the Hebrew Gospel; but here we make two observations. First, if the Gospel known to Origen and Jerome were not the primitive Hebrew Gospel, the fact of its existence and reception makes it difficult to believe that any previous Aramaic Gospel could have possessed Apostolic authority. We have contended just now that a Greek Gospel, recognized as authoritative by St. Paul, could not have been superseded by the extant Greek Gospels; and the very same argument shows it to be improbable that a Hebrew Gospel which St. Paul recognized as authoritative should have been so superseded by another Hebrew Gospel as that it should perish altogether and the title alone survive. In the second place, we would observe that the question concerning the antiquity of what is often quoted as 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews' is one which the most orthodox critic can discuss with a perfectly unbiassed mind. He is quite at liberty, if he thinks the evidence good enough, to maintain that it is of higher antiquity than any of the canonical Gospels—nay, that it was known to the compilers of these Gospels, and used by them in their work; for it would not follow that it was of superior authority. We know from St. Luke's preface that he was acquainted with the works of others who before him had attempted to frame a narrative of our Lord's life and teaching; but that he felt himself able to give an account more complete and more trustworthy than theirs. And such was the opinion of the Christian Church, which was content to let the earlier narratives drop into oblivion. It is conceivable that the so-called 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' might have been the last survivor of these early narratives: and, therefore, on the one hand, if internal evidence should lead us to pronounce any portions of this Gospel which have come down to us to be less trustworthy than cor-

¹ 'Fast alle von Hieronymus mitgetheilte Fragmente des Hebräerevangeliums, gegenüber den anerkannten Bestandtheilen des Urevangeliums einen stark ausgeprägten sekundären, apokryphisch verschlechterten Charakter an sich tragen, und somit für die Wiederherstellung des Urevangeliums fast ganz werthlos sind.'

responding passages in the canonical Gospels, we are not on that account entitled to infer that it must be later than those Gospels; and, on the other hand, if on any grounds we should be led to ascribe greater antiquity to the Hebrew than to the canonical Gospels, it would not follow that it possesses greater authority.

Our criticisms on Resch will be more intelligible if we give some samples of the problems with which his investigations present us. We take first the saying which we have quoted already: 'Be ye approved money-changers.' It is undoubtedly a fragment of a lost early Gospel; and the real question is what the date of that Gospel is likely to have been. The phrase is quoted three times in the Clementine *Homilies* (ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20), always in connexion with the peculiar doctrine of that work, viz. that some things in the Scriptures are true and some false,¹ and that the 'approved money-changer' was to show his skill in accepting the genuine and rejecting the spurious. That the saying in the Clementines is taken from a written source is evidenced by an independent quotation by Apelles, a second-century heretic of the Marcionite school, who cites the words as occurring 'in the Gospel.'² He interprets them in the same way, viz. as directing us to discriminate between those parts of the Old Testament which came from God and those which were dictated by the Demiurge.

Again, we have another independent witness to the ancient currency of this alleged saying of our Lord in Clement of Alexandria, who even quotes the passage as Scripture,³ a fact, however, which has less significance on account of Clement's habitual laxity in the use of uncanonical documents. He shows no sign of understanding the passage in the sense given it by pseudo-Clement and Apelles, from which we may infer that the context of the saying, in the Gospel from which

¹ In all these passages Matt. xxii. 29 is cited in the form 'Ye do err, not knowing the *true things* of the Scriptures,' which seems to be the form in which this text was read by the sectaries from whom the pseudo-Clementines emanated. The text is made to teach the same doctrine, viz. that only part of the contents of the Scriptures is true. This doctrine, which runs through the Clementine *Homilies*, is absent from the *Recognitions*. The notion that portions of the Old Testament were derived from a tainted source was common to several Gnostic sects. Thus Irenæus includes it in his account of the doctrine of Simon (i. 23), of Saturninus (i. 24), and of the people whom Theodoret calls Ophites (i. 30), if indeed all these are to be counted as distinct sects. Marcion carried the principle to the extreme of rejecting the Old Testament altogether.

² Epiphanius, *Hær.* xlv. 2.

³ *Strom.* i. 28.

it w
else
say:
with
this
acq
read
writ
'Pr
ever
beca
appe
note
con
sug
resu
abst

ing
to R
sup
Gos
I T
we
the
and
thin
But
disp
by s
Jesu
Paul
Orig
not
ascr
Cyri
as P
wor

1
2
1836,
'coin
this
defin
book
Engl

it was taken, did not impose this meaning on it. Three times elsewhere Clement indirectly exhibits knowledge of the saying.¹ These are the only authorities to which we can with certainty ascribe first-hand knowledge of the source of this saying, unless we add Origen, who, though no doubt acquainted with Clement's use of it, in all probability had read it in its original. It is quoted by a whole host of later writers, and almost always in connexion with St. Paul's words, 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good; abstain from every form of evil.' We quote from the Revised Version, because the translation of the Authorized Version, 'all appearance of evil,' is almost certainly wrong; but it is to be noted that in Patristic citations 1 Thess. v. 22 stands in closer connexion with the preceding verse than the Revised Version suggests. St. Paul is understood as stating the twofold result of 'proving all things:' hold fast to what is good, and abstain from every evil sort.

In what has been hitherto said we have been only repeating what has been long familiarly known; but we come now to Resch's peculiar hypothesis. We have already said that he supposes Paul to have been acquainted with the primitive Gospel, and he thinks that he borrowed from it the verse in 1 Thess. which we have just quoted; and accordingly that we can now restore the entire verse of that Gospel, of which the phrase 'Be ye approved money-changers' is but a fragment; and that it ran, 'Be ye approved money-changers: prove all things: hold fast to what is good, but reject every bad coin.'² But the quotations which he himself presents are sufficient to disprove this idea. Origen (*In Johann.* tom. xix. 2), followed by some later writers, expressly distinguishes the 'command of Jesus,' 'Be ye approved money-changers,' from the doctrine of Paul, 'Prove all things,' &c. If in the Gospel which he quotes Origen had read the whole as a saying of our Lord he would not have stopped short in his citation at the first clause and ascribed the rest to Paul. Then Resch relies on the fact that Cyril of Alexandria more than once quotes the whole saying as Paul's, which he accounts for by the hypothesis that the words 'Be ye approved money-changers' had come from the

¹ *Strom.* ii. 4, vi. 10, vii. 15.

² Resch has taken up an idea from Hänsel (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1836, p. 181) that the word *εἶδος* came to have the secondary meaning 'coin,' just as the word *specie* is used among ourselves. But his proof of this completely breaks down. It chiefly rests on the fact that Hesychius defines *κόλλυβος* as *εἶδος νομίσματος*. If it had been defined in an English book as 'a kind of coin' it might with as good reason be inferred that in English the word 'kind' is sometimes used to mean 'coin.'

margin into the text of 1 Thess. as read by Cyril. In the absence of any independent evidence of such an interpolation we think it more likely that in this instance Cyril was unduly trusting his memory. But suppose it all true that St. Paul's text in 1 Thess. had been corrupted by an interpolation from a Gospel; where is the evidence that the Gospel had ever contained the remainder of the verse in Thessalonians? The only thing certain is that Cyril had no suspicion that it did, for he quotes the whole as Paul's. Resch's proof, then, reduces itself to the form in which Clement quotes our Lord's saying in a passage already referred to: 'Reasonably does the Scripture exhort us, "Be ye approved money-changers, rejecting some things but holding fast what is good."' It is to be noted that Clement does not here describe his citation as a saying of our Lord, but as Scripture; and all that can be said is that he has mixed together two passages of what he accounted 'Scripture.' There is plainly no positive evidence to oppose to the strong negative evidence of Origen, from which we have inferred that the words 'Prove all things,' &c., were not in the Gospel.

Resch's discussion of the same passage enables us to estimate the value of his proofs that quotations from the primitive Gospel are made from an Aramaic source. When a writer in quoting a passage substitutes for a Greek word used by other writers another of equivalent meaning, Resch assumes that he must be translating from Aramaic for himself. But before we substitute this new explanation for the old one that the writer is quoting from memory we should at least like to be furnished with some reason for believing that he knew Aramaic. In the present case Resch actually includes Gregory the Great among his witnesses for the Aramaic origin of the passage we have before us. It is needless to discuss Gregory's knowledge of Hebrew, for the older and better witnesses are also open to suspicion. Thus one of the strongest points in Resch's case is that Clement of Alexandria in other places (*Strom.* iv. 15, vi. 10) has the word ἀργυραμοιβός instead of τραπεζίτης. Now anyone who reads the article 'Hebrew Learning' in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* will find abundant proof, not only that Clement habitually used the Septuagint, but that he was ignorant of Hebrew. And in the passages referred to by Resch he is not quoting our Lord's saying at all, but employing, in words of his own, an illustration which (we can readily concede) that saying, though not there quoted by him, probably suggested to his mind. Whatever else may be doubtful about this saying, this seems to us certain, that the evidence points to an

origi
for e
viii. 1
and t
occu
T
mark
of th
coun
giver
bring
mon
sever
He a
our L
that,
sayin
clude
7, Lu
woe
balan
throu
δι' οὐ
ἐπ' ἐ
remi
confi
St. F
So, a
2) an
are r
more
ἀζω
ὁ πε
N
in th
writt
are a
this
puts
woul
to ou
in ch
but
inter
ing i

original in the Greek form γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται. Thus, for example, the passage is brought to Clement's mind (*Strom.* viii. 15) by the occurrence of the word δόκιμοι in 1 Cor. xi. 19, and to the mind of the Clementine writer (*Hom.* iii. 61) by the occurrence of the word τραπεζίται in Matt. xxv. 27.

The passage just quoted gives opportunity for some remarks which seem to be called for as to the use made by Resch of the Clementines. We do not know why Resch has not counted among his 'agrapha' the words to which we have just given a reference: "It is thy duty, O man," saith He, "to bring my words like silver to the bankers and to test them like money;" "for they have quite as good a right to appear as several other sayings which he includes on the same authority. He also treats the Clementines as evidence to the sayings of our Lord, independent of and ranking with our Gospels, such that, by combining all, we can arrive at the form in which the sayings were recorded in the primitive Gospel. Thus he concludes from *Hom.* xii. 29 that the canonical saying (Matt. xviii. 7, Luke xvii. 1), "It must needs be that offences shall come, but woe to him through whom they come," had in the original a balancing clause, 'Good things must come, and blessed is he through whom they come' (τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ, μακάριος δὲ δὲ οὐ ἔρχεται· ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ οὐ ἔρχεται). Resch, whose skill in detecting concealed allusions reminds one of the game of 'buried cities,' finds a striking confirmation of the correctness of the Clementine form in St. Paul's ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ (*Rom.* iii. 8). So, again, the Clementine μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ (*xix.* 2) and the Pauline μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ (*Eph.* iv. 27) are regarded as derived from a common source. And, once more, the Clementine dictum (iii. 55) ὁ πονηρός ἐστὶν ὁ πειράζων is connected with 1 Thess. iii. 5, μὴ πως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων.

Now, before we assume that reports of our Lord's sayings in the Clementines are copied with verbal accuracy from a written Gospel, we must bear in mind that the Clementines are a work of fiction. No one imagines that the author of this romance had any written authority for the speeches he puts into the mouth of Peter. Have we any right to think he would be more scrupulous as to the sayings which he ascribes to our Lord? No doubt in this case his imagination was kept in check by the existence of authentic memoirs of our Lord; but some variation from these memoirs was essential in the interests of the fiction. For when Peter is introduced repeating in his own discourses his recollections of our Lord's sayings

the fiction would lose credibility if the supposed Peter could do nothing more than copy *verbatim* the account which all Christians had in their hands. We have a measure of this writer's accuracy in his report of our Lord's answer to the disciples, when he was asked concerning the man that was born blind, 'Which did sin, this man or his parents?' It is now generally acknowledged, even by critics free from all prejudice in favour of traditional beliefs, that the Clementine writer derived this story from St. John, and did not obtain it from an independent authority. In fact the words of our Lord, as reported in the fourth Gospel, have a stamp of their own; and Resch more than once observes that there are no Johannine 'agrapha.' Now the Clementine form of our Lord's answer is, 'Neither did he sin nor his parents, but that the power of God might be made manifest through him in healing the sins of ignorance.' If this is the way the Clementine writer deals with St. John's Gospel why should he be supposed to be more scrupulous in his treatment of the Synoptics?

But it has still to be added that the Clementine fiction is not a mere sport of fancy. It was a work intended to deceive, in which certain peculiar doctrines of the sect to which the writer belonged were intended to be commended by the authority of our Lord and the Apostle Peter. Consequently, in addition to variations from the canonical Gospels, which may be regarded as harmless embellishments of the story, there were some made with heretical intent. One example has already come before us. Three times he alters the text 'ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures' into 'not knowing the true things of the Scriptures,' his object being to gain countenance for his doctrine that the contents of the Scriptures are not all true. It is impossible not to connect the Clementine version of our Lord's sayings with the Ebionite Gospel, of which an account is given by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx.), which evidently emanated from the same sect, and which was full of arbitrary variations from the canonical Gospel, intended to commend the peculiar doctrines of that sect, in particular the doctrine of the unlawfulness of sacrifices or of the use of animal food. This was a composite Gospel, containing elements derived from all the canonical Gospels, including that of St. John. So that though we consider that the versions of our Lord's sayings in the Clementines need not necessarily be supposed to be derived from any written source, yet we have no objection to grant the possibility that they may have been so derived. Only, instead of that source being a primitive Gospel, we cannot think of it as other than a heretical

comp
to co
need
Cleme
This
theory
the u
to the
disput
So
of the
St. Pa
theref
testim
But th
The sy
in the
witness
critics
mitted
Gospel
earlier
means
they c
an earl
of oth
were h
witness
needin
source.
raises
tionall
firmati
nume
the Ep
Apocal
that Ja
Gospel
Peter's
that Pe
he too
tive G
acquai
Epistle
conclud

compilation not earlier than the third century. With regard to coincidences between the Clementines and St. Paul, we need look for no explanation beyond the obvious one that the Clementine forger was acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles. This is no hypothesis, but a notorious fact. Baur's whole theory of the anti-Paulinism of the Clementine writer rests on the undisputed fact that the *Homilies* contain angry reference to the account given in the Epistle to the Galatians of the dispute between Peter and Paul.

Something must now be said as to the intrinsic probability of the use of a written Gospel by New Testament writers. St. Paul had probably been never a hearer of our Lord's, and therefore we can readily grant that he was indebted to the testimony of others for his knowledge of our Lord's teaching. But the question remains, Was that testimony oral or written? The synoptic Gospels have unquestionably a common ancestor in the instruction orally given by Apostles or other eye-witnesses of the Saviour's life; but it is a question which critics still debate whether that instruction had been committed to writing before the composition of the synoptic Gospels. Now some of St. Paul's Epistles are undoubtedly earlier than any of these Gospels. It can, therefore, by no means be taken for granted, as Resch does, that 'agrapha,' if they can be found in St. Paul's writings, manifest his use of an earlier written Gospel. This becomes still clearer in the case of other New Testament writings. Peter, James, and John were hearers of our Lord who must have been able to bear witness to His teaching from their own recollection, without needing to seek for information in any extraneous written source. Resch, who is not a critic of the sceptical school, raises no question as to the authorship of the writings traditionally ascribed to the Apostles just named. Some confirmation of the traditional ascription is furnished by the numerous coincidences with our Lord's oral teaching found in the Epistle of St. James and in the first three chapters of the Apocalypse. Yet all these are produced by Resch as proofs that James and John drew their information from an earlier Gospel; and with regard to some which are found in St. Peter's Epistle also no account is taken of the supposition that Peter was acquainted with the Epistle of St. James, but he too is regarded as drawing independently from this primitive Gospel. Preceding critics had inferred that Peter was acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans, with which his Epistle exhibits numerous coincidences; but here too Resch concludes that when Peter and Paul agree in their forms of

expression both must be drawing from a pre-canonical Gospel. Thus he points out, as has been done before, that St. Peter's 'not rendering evil for evil' (iii. 9) is a verbal reproduction of St. Paul's words (Rom. xii. 17, 1 Thess. v. 15), whence he concludes that both Peter and Paul are using an unrecorded saying of our Lord; and he goes on to speculate that this saying in its full form included St. Peter's 'railing for railing' (see also 1 Pet. ii. 23, 1 Cor. iv. 12). He draws a similar inference from a striking verbal coincidence between 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14 and Rom. xiii. 13. Another saying of our Lord is discovered from the fact that the command 'Resist the devil' is common to Paul, Peter, and James (Eph. vi. 11, 13, 1 Pet. v. 8, 9, James iv. 7). So, again, 'love covereth a multitude of sins' (1 Pet. iv. 8, James v. 20).

Resch's easiness in accepting evidence to the use of a precanonical Gospel by New Testament writers has a cumulative effect, for when he has in a few cases decided to accept the evidence as amounting to a demonstration he considers that the fact of their use of such a Gospel having been 'proved,' we are entitled even on slender evidence to refer other of their sayings to the same source. But it may be well to examine more particularly into the evidence in some of the cases on which Resch most relies, for we believe it is as little decisive as in the case we have already examined (1 Thess. v. 21). Let us take first 1 Cor. ii. 9, R.V., 'which eye saw not and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love Him,' a verse on which the late Dr. Neale founded a theory likely to be known to many of our readers, viz. that the original of the passage is the Liturgy of St. James, which is thus supposed to be proved to be older than St. Paul. And the theological importance of this discovery is, as Dr. Neale says, tremendous; for the Liturgy has other coincidences with the Pauline Epistles, and if Dr. Neale is right we must abandon the old explanation that the framer of the Liturgy employed Scriptural expressions, and suppose that St. Paul borrowed from the Liturgy not only once but on several occasions. Dr. Neale's proof is as follows: St. Paul's words are not grammatically correct, for they begin with 'which' without any antecedent. But they are professedly a quotation; so we must suppose that the passage Paul was quoting was grammatically correct, and if we had it we should find the antecedent. But the Liturgy of St. James is grammatically correct, and there we have an antecedent, 'thy heavenly and eternal gifts which eye hath not seen.' Is it

not now
ance,
The log
rectness
a distin
1 Cor. i
an ante
second
the Ma
&c. Th
the two
Liturgy
length,
that St
written.
mitted f

We
Paul's q
lent cri
quotation
Isaiah l
Paul's d
Hebrew
anteced
Primitiv
Liturgy
quotation
counter
to such
discusse
Origen,
ascribed
suggests
of Jerem
credible
remarks
quoted.
9 he qu
found in
Elias.
tion hav
unsucces
reason m
evidence

not now absolutely certain, he asks, certain beyond all assurance, that this is the passage which St. Paul was quoting? The logic here is not quite convincing, for grammatical correctness is not so very rare as to be capable of being used as a distinguishing mark. Anyone who introduced the verse of 1 Cor. into a composition of his own would of course supply an antecedent; thus, for example, we find it in the so-called second Epistle of Clement with the antecedent 'promises,' in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* with the antecedent 'good things,' &c. This variety of antecedents indicates that the writers of the two last-named documents were not acquainted with the Liturgy of St. James. But it is needless to argue the case at length, for what demolishes Neale's speculation is the fact that St. Paul quotes the phrase with the formula 'It is written.' Now no one supposes that the Liturgy was committed to writing until a much later time.

We have still, however, to search for the source of St. Paul's quotation, and Dr. Neale is in the company of excellent critics, both ancient and modern, in thinking that the quotation is not, as an English reader might suppose, from Isaiah lxiv. 4. The differences are considerable between St. Paul's quotation and either the Septuagint version or the Hebrew text of Isaiah, and we look in vain in Isaiah for an antecedent for the 'which.' Resch, who rides his hobby of a Primitive Gospel as hard as Dr. Neale does that of a Primitive Liturgy, considers that he has here an instance of a Pauline quotation from that Gospel. But his hypothesis has to encounter great difficulties in the ignorance of early writers as to such a source for Paul's quotations. In fact, it was much discussed by the Fathers whence Paul had derived it. Origen, commenting on Matt. xxvii. 9,¹ where words are ascribed to Jeremiah which are really found in Zechariah, suggests that the quotation may be from an apocryphal work of Jeremiah; and to those to whom it might appear incredible that St. Paul should quote an apocryphal book he remarks that the apocryphal book of Jannes and Mambres is quoted by St. Paul (2 Tim. iii. 8); and that in 1 Cor. ii. 9 he quotes the words 'which eye hath not seen,' &c., which are found in no canonical Scripture, but only in the apocrypha of Elias. Some, he adds, on account of this apocryphal quotation have ventured to reject the Epistle to Timothy, though unsuccessfully; but he never heard of anyone for the same reason rejecting the Epistle to the Corinthians. There is evidence that an apocryphal book bearing the name of Elias

¹ *Ser. Comm. in Matt.* p. 117.

was in early times in circulation. It is quoted, for instance, by Epiphanius¹ in a passage which we shall presently again refer to, and it is mentioned, to be rejected as apocryphal, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 16), in the *Synopsis Scripturæ* of Pseudo-Athanasius, in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus, and elsewhere. We can well believe on Origen's authority that this book of Elias contained the words 'eye hath not seen,' &c. But the book having perished we are without the means of determining its date, or saying whether it was old enough to have been possibly known to St. Paul. It is quite possible that the book (which St. Jerome calls the Apocalypse of Elias) may have been a post-Christian fabrication, and may have borrowed this verse from the Epistle to the Corinthians. In favour of this supposition is the context in which Epiphanius mentions the book. When in his refutation of Marcion he comes to the Epistle to the Ephesians, he says that the verse 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light,' which 'no doubt comes from the Old Testament,' is found in Elias, which to all appearance Epiphanius accepted as part of the Old Testament. But this verse has certainly a post-Christian aspect, and in this case Neale's suggestion is well worthy of consideration that it may have been part of an early Christian hymn.

Jerome refers to the passage under consideration in his letter to Pammachius (*Ep.* 57), 'De optimo genere interpretandi.'² His translations from the Greek had been criticized as not being literal; and he defends himself by the example of the New Testament writers, who, he says, when quoting the Old Testament are only concerned to give the sense, and never care to quote word for word; and of this he gives several examples, among them 1 Cor. ii. 9. He scouts the idea that the Apostle could have used an apocryphal book; for in apocryphal books the devil sits in ambush to slay the innocent, as saith the psalmist, xi. 9: 'Insidiatur in apocrypho quasi leo in spelunca sua; insidiatur ut rapiat pauperem.' He mentions likewise that the passage is found not only in the Apocalypse of Elias but also in the *Ascensio Isaiaë*. This may have been so, though it is to be owned that there is no trace of it in the *Ascensio Isaiaë* as recovered from the Æthiopic by Archbishop Lawrence and subsequently by Dillmann. And it is very questionable whether this apocryphal book was old enough to have been conceivably accepted by Paul.

The verse 'eye hath not seen,' &c., came to be a favourite one with the Gnostic sects as describing the privileges of those

¹ *Her.* xlii.

² See also his *Commentary on Isaiaë*, lxiv. 2.

initiate
by Hi
27, pp.
comme
by Ste
some e
232).
say in
nor ear
things p
and tha
Scriptu
for they
hence i
criticis
But wh
in perfe
with th
that He
which (c
closely
but from
substitu
were on
semblan
quoted
through
But
St. Paul
Gospel.
tion in t
suspecte
from wh
to go no
rity. B
in the P
with tha
to an ap
Jerome
writers v
antedede
out the
the pass
elsewhere
words, 'XUM

initiated in their mysteries (see, for example, the account given by Hippolytus of Justin's book of Baruch, *Refutation*, v. 24, 27, pp. 149, 158). This is no doubt the explanation of a comment of Hegesippus known to us through a remark made by Stephen Gobar, a writer of the end of the sixth century, some extracts from whose writings are given by Photius (*Cod.* 232). Gobar does not understand how Hegesippus came to say in reference to the statement that 'neither hath eye seen nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man the good things prepared for the just,' that these things are vainly spoken, and that those who say so attribute falsehood to the Divine Scriptures and to our Lord, who says, 'Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear.' Baur and his school hence inferred that Hegesippus was anti-Pauline, and that his criticism was aimed against the Epistle to the Corinthians. But what Eusebius tells about Hegesippus shows that he was in perfect harmony with the Church rulers of his time, and with the doctrine of Eusebius himself; and what is decisive is that Hegesippus held in high esteem the Epistle of Clement which (ch. 34) incorporates Paul's words. When we examine closely we find that Hegesippus is not quoting from St. Paul, but from a different version, in which the words 'the just' were substituted for St. Paul's 'them that love Him,' and in which were omitted St. Paul's concluding words, which remove all semblance of opposition with the passage from the Gospels quoted by Hegesippus, 'but God hath revealed them to us through the Spirit.'

But it is time to come now to Resch's theory that both St. Paul and the Gnostics found these words in the Primitive Gospel. Now this theory has to encounter a strong presumption in the fact that this source had never previously been suspected. Origen, for example, is one of the authorities from which, in other cases, Resch derives his 'agrapha.' Thus, to go no further, his logia 4 and 5 rest on Origen's sole authority. But clearly if the words 'eye hath not seen,' &c., were in the Primitive Gospel, Origen could not have been acquainted with that document, or he would not have referred the words to an apocryphal source. The same thing must be said of Jerome; and the remark can be extended to the other early writers who quote the passage and seem unable to supply the antecedent to the 'which.' Clement of Rome (ch. 34) leaves out the 'which' altogether, and evidently has no authority for the passage but the Epistle to the Corinthians, which he cites elsewhere; but in quoting it he substitutes for St. Paul's words, 'them that love him,' the words of the Septuagint

Isaiah, 'them that wait for him.' We have already mentioned the variety of antecedents for the 'which' supplied by other early writers. Polycarp has the antecedent 'good things,' the second Epistle of Clement 'promises,' Clement of Alexandria (*Protrept.* x. 94) 'glory,' the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 32) 'those things,' and, as already stated, the Liturgy of St. James 'heavenly gifts.' All this variety gives us a right to think that these several writers knew of no other authority for the saying than the broken quotation of St. Paul, which they made grammatical each in his several way.¹ Resch's sole reason for his supposition seems to be that the quotation in the *Apostolic Constitutions* has in his ears a primitive ring. It runs, 'Then shall the wicked depart into everlasting punishment, and the righteous shall go into everlasting life, to inherit those things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, which God hath prepared for those that love Him; and they shall rejoice in the Kingdom of God.' Resch imagines that we have here the primitive form of the conclusion of the series of parables (Matt. xxv.). But in this and in other instances Resch appears to us to attribute far too great authority to the *Apostolic Constitutions*. We readily grant that the compiler of that forgery had command of a good library, and was acquainted with some ancient documents which had little circulation elsewhere; but he was an unscrupulous man who handled very freely the materials of which he made use, and in the present case we feel no temptation to regret the obvious explanation that the compiler of the *Constitutions* freely combined the language of Matt. xxv. and of 1 Cor. ii. We have not room for a discussion of other passages referred by Resch to the Primitive Gospel, such as 'Awake thou that sleepest' (Eph. v. 14) or St. James's 'The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy,' a verse which Resch takes to be kindred to St. Paul's 'The flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh' (Gal. v. 17), both having a common ancestor in a passage of the Primitive Gospel. In all these cases it is a fatal objection to Resch's theory that the early writers who might conceivably have been acquainted with a primitive Gospel, and in whose writings elsewhere Resch seeks for testimonies to its existence, appear to have had no suspicion that the passages in question came from such a source.

We are sorry that it has been necessary to take up so

¹ If there had been any uniformity of citation it would be more natural to think that the common authority was to be found in the Apocalypse of Elias rather than in the Primitive Gospel.

much
specula
matter
which
sources
Testam
might
some s
add a
ἀπὸ ἡλ
παρὴ λ
verse o
of a q
a refer
ἐσχατα

Mat
κρυβή
καὶ τὰ ἄ
Luk
παρεχέ
Luk
Luk
οὐ τὸ π
1 Ti
ἀληθιν

We
early ti
Gospels
this is s
light ki
and by
things
'There
which c
quotes
is the p
pretens
examin
that aft
with wh
to have
article
prove to

much space in exhibiting the weakness of the evidence for the speculations in which Resch is original, that this controversial matter has left us little room to do justice to the industry with which he has made his collection of 'agrapha' from various sources, and to the care with which he has studied the New Testament, noting many coincidences of expression which might easily have been overlooked. We have already given some samples of his skill in this respect, and it must suffice to add a few more. Thus he combines Rev. xxi. 4, τὰ πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον· ἰδοὺ καινὰ πάντα ποιῶ, with 2 Cor. v. 17, τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν· ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ τὰ πάντα, in order to recover a verse of the Primitive Gospel which may serve as the original of a quotation in Barnabas, which has much more the air of a reference to the Old Testament, λέγει δὲ Κύριος· ἰδοὺ ποιῶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα. Others of his combinations are—

Matt. v. 16, 14, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα· οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὀρους κειμένη. 1 Tim. v. 25, τὰ καλὰ ἔργα πρόδηλά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα κρυβῆναι οὐ δύναται.

Luke xi. 7, μή μοι κόπους ἄρῃ. Gal. vi. 17, κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω.

Luke xviii. 9, τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς. 2 Cor. i. 9, x. 17.

Luke xxi. 24, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἔθνων. Rom. xi. 25, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πληρωμα τῶν ἔθνων εἰσέλθῃ.

1 Tim. iii. 1, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος. Rev. xxi. 5, οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ εἰσιν.

We have no controversy with Resch as to the fact that in early times there must have circulated, in addition to our four Gospels, another Gospel somewhat different. We consider that this is sufficiently proved by Justin Martyr's reference to the light kindled in Jordan at our Lord's baptism (*Dial.* § 88), and by his quotations as sayings of our Lord, 'In whatsoever things I find you in these will I judge you' (*ibid.* § 47), and, 'There shall be schisms and heresies' (*ibid.* § 35), in both which cases we acquiesce in the obvious explanation that Justin quotes from a lost Gospel. But it is another question what is the probable date of that Gospel, and whether it has any pretensions to be pre-canonical. We had intended here to examine whether Justin's lost Gospel can be identified with that afterwards known as the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with which Justin as a native of Palestine might be expected to have had some acquaintance, but the length to which our article has run forbids our now entering into what would prove to be a very large subject.

ART. II.—ST. AUGUSTINE'S 'CITY OF GOD.'

1. *The City of God*. Written by ST. AUGUSTINE. English translation by J. H. First published in 1610. 2 vols. (London, 1890.)
2. *Augustinische Studien*. Von Hermann Reuter. No. III. 'Die Kirche "das Reich Gottes."' (Gotha, 1887.)

THE influence of St. Augustine is perennial. His spiritual insight and his masculine intellect gave him in his own time a position of acknowledged authority. All the larger issues which distracted the Church in an age of conflict without and within came sooner or later before the Bishop of Hippo for settlement. 'One great controversy,' says Dr. Mozley, 'is usually enough for one man; but he conducted, or it may be said finished, three.' And the verdict of the fifth has been confirmed by that of subsequent centuries, of the sixteenth as well as of the thirteenth, of the nineteenth as well as of the ninth. There has been no religious movement of the first rank which has not been inspired by the spirit of St. Augustine, or at least striven to shelter itself under his name. Men of very different schools have found affinities to their own systems in the writings of one who was at once Catholic, Platonist, Predestinarian, Doctor of Grace, and upholder of ecclesiastical unity.¹ That 'strong, capacious, argumentative mind'² held in fusion tendencies which seem to lesser men inconsistent. Yet he defended them with an abundant copiousness of rhetoric and with a philosophical power which, however subtle, never lost sight of the great landmarks of the road along which the argument was moving. Thus his writings have at times been used as quarries from which men have fetched stones for widely diverse buildings. St. Augustine, however, is himself the best corrective of the exaggerations of his friends as well as of his foes. And just as the watchword 'Back to Kant' has stood for the return to philosophical sanity, so the return to the study of St. Augustine as he is, greater than any of those who claim to be his pupils, the fount at once of mediæval Scholasticism and of mediæval Mysticism, the teacher of Duns Scotus and of Thomas Aquinas, of Dante and of Luther, is at all times of good omen for theology.

¹ For the influence of St. Augustine on subsequent ages see Nourisson, *La Philosophie de S. Augustin*, livre ii. ch. ii., and Cunningham, *St. Austin*, p. 142, Excursus B, and p. 177, Excursus G.

² Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv. 309.

But
place
the Fa
the at
lent a
stands
second
publis
pende
of Me
theref
knowl
the fir
lent a
words
accura

TH
life.
finishe
It can
contro
were v
his las
unfini
on the
is it tr
the g
must
after
adequ
the u
must
his wh
what

¹ T
vol. iii.
felicit
⁴ no po
theolog
² T
books
³ p
⁴ C
Early
⁵ T
logical

But, in the revival of Augustinian studies which has taken place in England since the publication of the *Library of the Fathers*, the *De Civitate Dei* seems hardly to have received the attention which it deserves.¹ We have indeed the excellent and scholarly translation of Dr. Marcus Dods. But it stands alone:² it is the first translation in English since the second edition of that by J. H. (with Vives's commentary), published in 1620; while in French there are eight independent translations, one of four editions.³ The new volumes of Messrs. Griffith, Farran, and Co.'s Theological Library are therefore a well-timed and useful contribution to the wider knowledge of Christian theology. They are reprinted from the first edition of the translation by J. H., which is in excellent and readable English, with just enough old-fashioned words to give it a flavour of quaintness, and is also fairly accurate as a rendering of the Latin.

The *De Civitate Dei* is the mature fruit of St. Augustine's life. It was begun when he was close on sixty; it was finished when he was seventy-two, four years before his death. It cannot be said that when he wrote the *De Civitate Dei* his controversies were over. His first two anti-Pelagian treatises were written in the year before the *De Civitate Dei* was begun; his last was commenced in the year before his death and left unfinished. But he had made up his mind, and taken his side on the last of the great controversies of his life.⁴ Nor, again, is it true that the *De Civitate Dei* contains his last words on the great questions which he had handled. For these we must look to the *Retractations*. But the *Retractations* are after all only scattered corrections. For anything like an adequate representation of St. Augustine's final judgment on the ultimate questions of philosophy and of theology we must turn to the *De Civitate Dei*; and it is the only work of his which covers more or less the whole field.⁵ It shows us what he had to say at the end of his life on the various

¹ The estimate of the *De Civitate Dei* in Professor Jowitt's *Plato*, vol. iii. p. 186, is extremely misleading. 'Feeble in reasoning' is not a felicitous phrase to describe Augustine's work; and to say that he has 'no power of feeling or understanding anything external to his own theology' is to ignore, among other things, his debt to Platonism.

² The translation by the Rev. T. A. Walker (London, 1871) is only of books xi.-xiv.

³ Preface to Dr. Marcus Dods's translation, p. xvi.

⁴ On St. Augustine as a controversialist cf. Mozley, *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, lect. xi.

⁵ The *Enchiridion ad Laurentium* is a manual rather than a theological or philosophical treatise.

systems of thought through which he had passed, and on the various controversies in which he had been engaged.

The book was primarily intended for cultivated pagans. It was characteristic of St. Augustine to carry on at the same time, and on the initiative of the same friend, this great Apologia to the Gentiles, and the controversy on grace and free will with imperfectly instructed Christians. The two sides appear within the *De Civitate Dei* itself; he is striving to convince those without, but also to build up and strengthen those within; and as his work draws to its close the apologetic interest pales before the inner glories of the City of God. He never forgot that double duty, and he deals with both sides of it in the same living way. The *De Civitate Dei* has been called the Encyclopædia of the fifth century. That is of course true in a sense. St. Augustine's was the greatest mind of the fifth century, and the *De Civitate Dei* is the fullest and most erudite of his writings. But no more infelicitous phrase can be conceived. The work has neither the merits nor the defects of an encyclopædia. It is not orderly, nor is it dry. In method, as in other matters, St. Augustine is a follower rather of Plato than of Aristotle; and it must be confessed that the *De Civitate Dei* is a somewhat rambling work. Questions are dropped, and perhaps a year or two later taken up again from a somewhat different point of view. There are constant repetitions, and the digressions are long, and sometimes on points which seem to us insignificant. But all this makes it emphatically a living book. We feel that we are being brought into touch with arguments which were actually used, and with questions which really weighed on men's consciences. If St. Augustine seems to turn aside from his course, it is because an assailant has started up at his side. It is true that the answer to the earlier section of the work which he mentions as having been prepared¹ was probably never made public: it was kept for a favourable opportunity, and the favourable opportunity never came. But there would be ample time for objections and criticisms to reach St. Augustine in the intervals during which he laid down his pen. With these he thought it his duty to deal, though, as he pleads truly, not all objections can be answered.²

The immediate incentive to write the *De Civitate Dei* came from Augustine's friend Marcellinus, a noble Roman and an ardent Christian, who had been sent to Africa by the Emperor Honorius to arrange some settlement of the disputes between Catholics and Donatists which were troubling the

¹ *De Civitate Dei*, v. 26.

² II. 1.

prov
sian
cons
her
chie
of H
thei
linu
him
conf
that
ing
of R
Em
in th
Vol
at le
hand
at o
wor

Aug
felt
Mer
mar
fall
sym
the
hav
thin
the
fear
bole
clair
in d
pag
mac
miss
Rom
part

1
a ch
2
tine
3

province. Augustine, at the request of the mother of Volusian, a Roman of high position, and now or afterwards Proconsul of Africa, had put himself into correspondence with her son. Volusian sent him notes of some difficulties, relating chiefly to the Incarnation, which had been raised at a meeting of himself and his friends, and which stood in the way of their acceptance of Christianity. At the same time Marcellinus, who knew Volusian well, and was also anxious to win him over to Christianity, wrote to say that Volusian had confined himself to these points in writing to Augustine, but that difficulties as to the consistency of Christian teaching (e.g. of the Sermon on the Mount) with the imperial rule of Rome, and as to the misfortunes which had befallen the Empire under Christian emperors, were constantly discussed in the group of statesmen and great Roman officials to which Volusian belonged. He therefore urges Augustine to reply at length,¹ telling him that his answer would pass into many hands. Augustine sent replies to both of his correspondents at once, but he meets Marcellinus's request more fully in the work before us.²

It was not, indeed, only for Volusian and his friends that Augustine wrote. The shock of the fall of Rome was deeply felt: it penetrated to the utmost bounds of the Empire. Men saw at once that it was one of those events which mark epochs in world-history. It was much more than the fall of the greatest city of the world: it was the sign and symbol of the collapse of the old social order. 'When Rome, the head of the world,' Lactantius had written earlier, 'shall have fallen, who can doubt that the end is come of human things, aye, and of the earth itself?'³ St. Augustine saw the opportunity. When men's hearts were failing them for fear, and for dread of what should come, Christianity stepped boldly forward to assert her claim to the vacant throne. The claim is made in the *De Civitate Dei*. Yet it is made rather in defence than in aggression. It was in Rome itself that paganism made its last serious rally. In the year 383 Symmachus, prefect of Rome, had petitioned Theodosius for permission to worship the old gods in the old way. The fall of Rome drove many Romans to take refuge in Africa, the only part of the world, as it seemed, secure from the advancing

¹ Ep. 136: 'Plenus debet et elucubratus solutionis splendor ostendi'—a characteristically Roman point of view.

² Ep. 132-8. Marcellinus was killed in the year in which St. Augustine began his book, but it is addressed to him.

³ Lactantius *Inst.* vii. 25.

hosts of the Goths. They were pagans and openly ascribed the calamities of the Empire to the neglect of the ancient gods of Rome and the rise of Christianity. Their arguments were putting a strain on the African Christians, and St. Augustine wrote, as he tells us in the *Retractations*,¹ to answer the attacks which they made on the Christian religion, and also, as is clear from the whole drift of the book, to reassure his friends. In the first five books he deals with the position of those who base the duty of worshipping the pagan gods on the immediate temporal advantages to be thus obtained. The more definitely apologetic section is completed by five more books in answer to the philosophic paganism which associated the worship of the heathen gods with the goods of the world to come. The second or mainly constructive section consists of twelve books, tracing the origin, growth, and end of the two cities, the City of God and the city of this world. The two sides are, however, necessarily intertwined, and this is especially the case in the earlier section, in which St. Augustine, at intervals or at the ends of books frequently relieves the critical analysis of his opponent's views by showing that Christianity gives a full and satisfactory answer to the difficulties which he exposes.

It is impossible, within the limits at command, even to touch on all the varied lines of thought which Augustine works out or suggests in the *De Civitate Dei*. To do so would need a book. It is therefore necessary to select. We do not propose to say anything here of St. Augustine's direct contribution to dogmatic theology, except in regard to the doctrine of the Church. For a complete statement of his teaching on the Trinity, on the Incarnation, on the Sacraments, on Grace, we have to look to other writings than the one now before us. But the characteristic points of the *De Civitate Dei*, those in which it throws the fullest light, among all Augustine's writings, on his views, are (1) its philosophy of history, (2) its survey of the different systems of thought which contested with Christianity in the fifth century the sway over men's minds, and (3) the conception of the two cities and of their relation to one another. On each of these points we give some account of the drift of St. Augustine's teaching.

I. At the outset St. Augustine sets himself to justify God's ways to those Christians who had suffered grievous losses in the sack of Rome. He lays down the broad principle that temporal good and evil are common to the good and bad. If temporal goods were given only to the good, men

¹ *Retract.* ii. 43.

would serve God from lower motives; if they were given to none, men would fail to realise that their lives were in God's hands. The difference between good and bad men is to be seen in the *use* which they make of the fortune, good or bad, which comes to them. The same fire makes gold glitter and straw smoke. What matters is, not what things a man suffers, but what kind of man he is who suffers them. Nor must the good plead that they deserve no punishment: besides their own lesser sins they have to reproach themselves with their tolerance of greater sins in others. Such unfaithfulness is rightly punished with temporal loss, though not with eternal punishment. But the temporal loss will benefit and not harm them, if their wills remain steadfast. No loss of goods can touch those who are already poor in will; those who are not may learn from it a needed lesson. 'They lost all they had; but did they lose faith? or piety? or the goods of the inner man, which are before God the true riches?'¹

And then he turns from comforting his own flock to meet their foes. Where are their own gods? Why have they not saved them? Has not the very name of Christ been a refuge to His friends and even to His enemies, for the Goths spared the Christian churches and all who took shelter therein? What *temples* were spared? Here the defence broadens out into a general indictment of paganism. So far from the common saying being true, '*Pluvia defit; causa Christiani sunt,*' history shows us that Rome suffered the most terrible evils before the very name of Christ was known. Nor were those evils merely temporal losses; they included the greatest calamity which a State can undergo, the gradual decay of morality. Listen to the evidence of Sallust: '*Respublica paulatim mutata ex pulcherrima atque optima, pessima atque flagitiosissima facta est;*' and Cicero confirms it. What did the gods do to save the falling State? They did nothing: they may have whispered counsels of virtue in the ears of some select few, but there was no public preaching of morality; there was nothing to arrest the people in their downward course. Nay, more, the gods themselves gave the first impulse to Rome's decline: they allowed and loved the scandalous stories men told of them: they insisted on the public display of unutterable abominations in the scenic games. Are not the Christians justified in saying that these gods were *dæmons*, and that it is only the true God who can restore men to health and freedom?²

But, if the question is to be of temporal loss, then a review

¹ I. 8-28.

I. 29-33, II. 3-end.

of Roman history, from the foundation of the city to the time of Augustus, shows us clearly enough that Rome had her fair share of those earthly calamities which befall good and bad alike. Neither temples nor images saved the city from grave disasters, though they were revered, not as perishing symbols of eternal things, but exactly as preservatives of present goods. Nor did the gods themselves secure their worshippers that prosperity for which they worshipped them.¹

But, it is urged, it is under the protection of these gods that Rome has grown up and her empire spread over the earth. To this objection St. Augustine has two answers: the first traverses the ground on which the objection rests; the second shows that, even assuming that ground to be true, the position of the objector is confused and untenable. The assumption which underlies the objection is that greatness is to be measured by size. Is this a true test? It is not in proportion to the vast area over which it rules that a state is great, but in proportion to its justice, *i.e.* the strength of the forces which bind it into one coherent and moral whole. Without justice a state is but a band of robbers.² No doubt it is well that the good should rule widely—well, that is, for human affairs, rather than for themselves. For themselves piety and honesty are sufficient, and it is a matter of indifference whether they rule or are ruled. But the rule of the bad hurts themselves more than their subjects, and it hurts them the more, the more widely extended it is; it gives them a larger field whereon to display the vices by which they are enslaved. Further, large kingdoms are always due to wrongdoing, either their own or their neighbours'. They have their origin, one way or other, in injustice. The true and natural type of earthly society is to be found in a number of small states living at peace with one another, like the many houses in one city.³ We shall have occasion to allude again to this passage in discussing St. Augustine's theory of the State; but we notice here the completeness of its challenge to the fundamental political conceptions of his time. As against imperial Rome, gathering all races under her world-wide sway, he sets the ideal of a federation of nation-states at peace with one another, and guided—for this is implied—by the peace-working maxims of Christian morality, like many houses within one City of God. As against the Roman glorification of force

¹ III. *passim*, esp. 18.

² 'Remota itaque justitia, quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia?' IV. 4.

³ IV. 4-6, 15.

and power, as such, he holds—and here he is at one both with the Stoics and with Plato—that justice is the true bond of States, and that the ultimate ground which induces the just to rule is that, on the whole, it is better so than that they should be ruled by the unjust and evil.

Secondly, St. Augustine brings out, in a series of chapters of great dialectic force, though of less interest to us, the contradictory and inconsistent nature of the Roman mythology. Rome grew under the protection of the gods. But which of the gods? Was it Jupiter? 'Jovis omnia plena.' But why then surround him with a crowd of lesser gods and goddesses, one for every function of life? Would not Victoria be enough, or Felicitas? And are not these things divine gifts rather than gods? Yes, answers the cultivated polytheist, gifts of unknown gods, whom we worship under their name. But why not, then, gifts of one God unknown to them but known to us, the Author and Giver of all good things?¹

And so from the attack on the pagan gods he passes to explain from a Christian standpoint the vast empire of Rome. No mere fate is adequate to explain the phenomena of human life. It is God, the one true God, who is the God of all history, Roman as well as Jewish. It was He who allowed the Roman power so to increase. The distinctive mark of Rome was ambition, the love of glory and human praise; led by ambition, the Romans sought liberty for themselves and rule over others. For this they made great sacrifices, they disciplined themselves, and surrendered their private fortunes to the State. And ambition may be regarded as relatively a virtue. For, if baser lusts are not to be reined in by faith and piety, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, and by the love of rational beauty, it is better they should be so by the love of glory and human praise than not at all. Yet ambition is absolutely a vice, though in some it may be an approach to virtue. Cato, who did not seek glory, but to whom it came, is a nobler character than Cæsar, who sought it for its own sake. And so the saints of God fought with ambition as an enemy of the fear and love of God. To both God gives the appropriate reward. To the Romans earthly success was the one end. They loved glory, and for it they resisted avarice, lust, and crime. Their empire became great; their fame is throughout the world; they have no reason to complain of the justice of God: 'perceperunt mercedem suam.' But the sacrifices of the saints are greater, and so is their reward. Their City is eternal: no departure of the dying, no birth of

¹ IV. 8-25, 33.

those to die; no need for private stinting for the public weal, for there is the common treasury of truth. We, who have received the pledge of faith, while pilgrims here yet sigh for the beauty of that place of full and perfect blessedness.¹

St. Augustine's answer to the question, 'What is the meaning of the Roman Empire in a reasonable account of world history?' is then, first, that the glory of the Roman name was a God-given reward. The Romans did for a time rule justly and give good laws and wise government to their subjects, and therefore God allowed Roman power to increase, as He now, as a consequence of their moral degeneracy, allows it to decline. It is here that we find the explanation of the subjugation of the Jews by the Romans. The Romans had a low standard, but they lived by it: they had the virtues or semi-virtues appropriate to an earthly state. The Jews had greater opportunities. They were surrounded by temporal blessings, which they were meant to perceive, and which the more spiritual among them did perceive, to be types and symbols of eternal things; they were placed in an earthly preparatory to a heavenly state. But they failed to correspond to their opportunities; they sought strange gods instead of following the one eternal God; they finally killed Him who came to reveal to them the eternal Truth, which had been shadowed forth all through their history. And therefore they were rightly given up as a trophy to Rome.² But, secondly, just as the Jewish dispersion paved the way for Christianity by spreading the knowledge of Jewish prophecy, so the power and success of Rome was given her by God, in order that the citizens of the Heavenly City might learn from her history the rewards of true patriotism, of devoted love and service given even for lower ends and to an earthly state. In this respect the lower could be an example and a model to the higher.³

Thus St. Augustine's justification of God in history centres round the following points: (1) that God rules all history—Roman, Jewish, Assyrian, Ninevitic, Persian—and that though we cannot pretend to know all the hidden motives of His government, yet we can see enough to show us that it is not an *arbitrary* government, but is based on justice;⁴ (2) that in history all goodness or merit of whatever kind receives its appropriate reward; (3) that from the higher point of view that goodness can alone be called virtue which has for its aim the supreme good of man, *i.e.* the one

¹ V. 12-18, 21.

² IV. 34, V. 18.

³ V. 18.

⁴ V. 19, 21. See especially at end of 21: 'Hæc plane Deus unus et verus regit ut placet; et si occultis causis, numquid injustis?'

true
som
kind
are
rew
mee
thou
as t
mou
in th
furl
of G
to h
conv
itsel
from
sect
subj
infor
the
cont
Rom
wrot
foll
exta
ligh
theo
to h
the
cons
ralis
in w
to di
scien
T
First
Varr
by s

¹ A
Dei m
tione
tury),
di uno

true God, but that forms of goodness which have for their aim some lesser and created good are rewarded after their own kind by earthly good or evil; the nations that merit success are successful; (4) that earthly success is not an appropriate reward for true virtue, and therefore that the servants of God meet with both good and evil fortune in earthly things, though both may be so used, and are intended to be so used, as to be good for them; (5) lastly, that in history all things mount up to Christianity, and that earthly states, complete in themselves as manifestations of God's justice, must yet be further regarded as preparatory for, or ancillary to, the City of God.¹

II. In turning from St. Augustine's philosophy of history to his criticisms of the great philosophic systems, it will be convenient no longer to follow the exact order of the work itself, but to group together references to each philosophy from its different parts. The second half of the apologetic section (books vi.-x.) is, however, entirely devoted to this subject, and it is here that we find far the greater part of our information.

In books vi. and vii. he enters upon the consideration of the monumental work of the learned and acute M. Varro, the contemporary of Cicero, the recognized expositor of the Roman state religion in its more cultured form. Varro wrote forty-one books, twenty-five on *antiquitates humanae*, followed by sixteen on *antiquitates divinae*. His work is not extant, but St. Augustine's comments throw considerable light on its contents. He worked on a threefold division of theology—(1) mythic, (2) natural, (3) civil—and his aims seem to have been to reject from the civil and throw back on to the mythic theology whatever was irrational, immoral, or inconsistent, and further to keep in the background the naturalistic or materialist interpretations of the current theology in which he himself really believed, lest the effect should be to disturb the hold of the civil theology on the popular conscience.

Thus St. Augustine's criticism follows three main tracks. First he endeavours to break down the distinction which Varro emphasizes between the mythic and the civil theology, by showing that it is, partly indeed from the natural or

¹ Among those whose treatment of history is based on the *De Civitate Dei* may be mentioned: Paulus Orosius (417 A.D.), Salvianus (*De Gubernatione Dei*, 455), Isidore of Seville (*Etymologies*, bk. v., in the seventh century), Bossuet (*Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*, 1670), Vico (*Principi di una Scienza nuova*, 1725).

philosophic, but mainly from the mythic, that the civil theology draws its material. 'Civilis et fabulosa ambæ fabulosæ sunt, ambæque civiles.'¹ Secondly, he criticizes, as it were incidentally, the esoteric physical interpretation of polytheism, which is the natural theology of Varro—incidentally, because he reserves his completer discussion for the higher and non-materialist 'natural' theology of the Platonists. This esoteric interpretation made the different gods stand for the different parts or perfections of Jupiter, while Jupiter himself stands for the *anima mundi*, related to the world as body to soul. St. Augustine urges that this esoteric interpretation passes over at once into a degrading form of pantheism, which represents the stones and earth as the bones and nails of God, the sun, moon, and stars as His senses, and the ether His mind; further, that the conception of soul is not adequate to describe God, because soul implies mutability, and therefore that God must be thought as the Maker of souls rather than as Himself a soul.² Thirdly, he utters the loudest protests against the sacrifice of truth to policy in Varro's system. Varro is an Erastian; he puts human things first and divine things last, on the express ground that states must be treated before their institutions, thus implying that theology is concerned not with the real nature of the gods but with human opinions and institutions about religion. And so he is afraid to purify the theology which he records; if he had been founding a new state he would have written in accordance with the truth of Nature, but in an old one he must follow established usage. The truth is that Varro is one of those who is content to teach what he knows to be false in order to maintain the bonds of civil society, one of those who 'ea, quæ vana esse noverant, religionis nomine populis tanquam vera suadebant, hoc modo eos civili societati velut aptius alligantes, quo . . . subditos possiderent.'³

From the political religion of Varro, with its materialist background and its fundamental taint of dishonesty, Augustine passes to the more congenial discussion of the great philosophies. And of these the two which stand out most prominently in the *De Civitate Dei*, as they did in the thought of Augustine's time, are the Stoic and the Platonic. We have, however, first to consider Manichæism and Academicism.

To that Manichæan controversy which St. Augustine knew from end to end, there are comparatively few direct

¹ VI. 8.² IV. 11-13, 31; VII. 5, 6, 23; VIII. 5 (*ad fin.*).³ IV. 31, 32; VI. 4.

allusi
St. A
by h
publi
leade
that
in his
chæis
down
starts
are n
we as
Who
it? th
the W
the w
goodn
uncha
it, and
true t
the ev
effort
conqu
tion v
motiv
Him.
for?
princi
natur
has n
ultima
it mu
itself
the w
from
is not
evil is
one;
answe
cause
man's

¹ X² X³ X

qui nor

VOD

allusions in the *De Civitate Dei*. No doubt the example of St. Augustine's own conversion, and the great effect produced by his anti-Manichæan sermons and treatises, and by his public discussion in the baths of Sozium with the Manichæan leader Fortunatus, had told against the sect. Yet we know that his controversy with them was carried on till quite late in his life, and the indirect traces of his reaction from Manichæism are seen in the very careful way in which he lays down the nature of evil and its relation to the will. He starts with two theological postulates. The first is that there are not two principles in the world, but one—that is, God. If we ask with regard to any creature whatever the questions, Who made it? How did He make it? Why did He make it? the answers are all in cases the same, viz. God, Through the Word, Because it is good. Plato is right here. God made the world because He is good, to be a reflexion of His own goodness.¹ The second postulate is that the nature of God is unchangeable and incorruptible; evil cannot affect or thwart it, and there is nothing that can injure it. Thus it cannot be true to say either that the nature of God is held captive by the evil in the world, and only set free and purged by great effort, some portion still being left as a prison-house of the conquered foe; nor, as Origen did, that the object of creation was the restraining of evil. Creation must have its motive in God's own nature, not in that which lies outside Him.² Assuming these postulates, how is evil to be accounted for? Clearly not as a separate self-existent substance or principle, but as a falling away from good. 'Mali enim nulla natura est; sed amissio boni, mali nomen accepit.'³ Evil has no *natura*: it can never form part of the primary or ultimate order of things, of 'the world as God has made it': it must always be a misuse or perversion of that which in itself is good. This misuse or perversion has its source in the will, whether of angels or men, and it consists in turning from the highest Being to some being (*e.g.* their own) which is not the highest.⁴ It may, therefore, be called pride. Thus evil is failure; it has no efficient cause, but only a deficient one; the cause of the good will is God, but there can be no answer to the question, What is the cause of the bad will? Its cause is neither in God nor in any created thing, nor in the man's nature whose will it is. The evil will is a *defect*

¹ XI. 21; cf. XII. 2.² XI. 22, 23.³ XI. 9 *ad fin.* Cf. XI. 13 (of the Devil): 'in veritate non stetit.'⁴ XII. 6: 'Ab Illo, qui summe est, aversi, ad se ipsos conversi sunt, qui non summe sunt.'

(*vitium*) of the rational nature, and being a defect it bears witness to the goodness of the nature which it affects;¹ but at the same time it is itself fundamentally unnatural, and therefore harms the nature which it affects, and so far it is contrary to good, and, if so, to God. But it cannot harm God. God's nature, as we have seen, is incorruptible. His enemies harm themselves, not Him; they have the will to resist, but not the power to hurt. But how, then, is it that God allows evil to exist at all? Here St. Augustine's answer is twofold. First, much that seems to us evil is not really so. Apparent defects in beings other than rational are due to the imperfections of our knowledge, or they form part of a transitory and passing order, and are not permanent. But, secondly, God allows evil wills to exist, and will continue to do so for all time, because the noblest harmony implies the union of opposing parts. Like some fair poem the movement of the centuries has its paradoxes. Like some picture with its shadows, the world is fair even with its sinners, base and deformed as they are if taken by themselves.² Such are the metaphysics of good and evil which St. Augustine sets before us in the *De Civitate Dei*. Though for the most part without express reference, they give us the enduring results of his own Manichæan controversy. It may be doubted whether more modern writers carry us much further than St. Augustine did. Sooner or later the answer which St. Augustine gives to the question, What is the cause of the evil will? must round off our enquiry into evil. But on the two cardinal points (1) that evil is not a separate principle over against God; (2) that the seat of evil is in the will—*i.e.* in the centre of the man's personality rather than in anything like intellect which can be regarded as a separable faculty for which he is only partially responsible—St. Augustine is clear and strong.

From Manichæism we pass, as Augustine passed in his own life, to Academicism. Manichæism, with its too confident dogmatism and its too rigorous asceticism,³ easily over-balanced itself and passed into the philosophy of universal doubt. How can we know Truth? That was the question which agitated and baffled St. Augustine in his transition time from Manichæism to Platonism, and the 'great waves of his thoughts' bore him along towards the Academic or

¹ XI. 17: 'Ubi est vitium malitiæ, natura non vitata præcessit.' Cf. XII. 1.

² XI. 18, 23; XII. 4.

³ The Manichæans thought it wrong to destroy any form of life, even to pluck a twig (I. 20).

Sept
often
the L
witho
ment
from
know
To th
answe
could
it foll
exist.
two e
ledge
and k
toward
as my
to be
existe
cord
by wh
the se
organ
which
spiritu
from
Love.
St
greate
fewest
had vi
H

¹ Z
² T
³ S
human
⁴ X
⁵ W
of the t
De Otia
vere pu
adscript
ἀνθρώπων
είναι, w
Zeller,
de la S
the Sto

Sceptical answer.¹ The solution which he found is stated often in his writings,² but with singular clearness and force in the *De Civitate Dei*. It anticipates the Cartesian answer, without laying so undivided a stress on the intellectual element in certainty, as Descartes did. He finds the passage from doubt to certainty threefold. First, I am; secondly, I know that I am; thirdly, I love to be and to know that I am. To the Academic doubt, What if you are deceived? the answer is that I, who am deceived, must exist; otherwise I could not be deceived. Since I exist, even if I am deceived, it follows that I am not deceived in my knowledge that I exist. I not only am, but know that I am. And to these two elements of certainty—my own existence and my knowledge of that existence—a third may be added: I love to be and know that I am. For, even if my love were directed towards false objects, it would still remain that I loved; and as my love is directed towards objects which have been shown to be true, viz. my own existence, and my knowledge of that existence, it is itself doubly true, and makes up the threefold³ cord of certainty. Further, St. Augustine finds the faculty by which we lay hold on certain truths to be independent of the senses, or rather to be a kind of inner sense, which is the organ of judgment, as the senses of apprehension, and by which we distinguish just and unjust. This inner sense is a spiritual light which irradiates the mind of man, flowing from Him who is eternal Being, eternal Truth, and eternal Love.⁴

Stoicism and Platonism St. Augustine discusses at much greater length. With both he had some points of contact, fewest with Stoicism, most with Platonism, and with both he had vital differences.

He is Stoic rather in temper than in tenets.⁵ Such sen-

¹ *De Utilitate Credendi*, cap. viii.

² The passages are collected by Cunningham (*St. Austin*, pp. 22-5).

³ St. Augustine endeavours to find in this threefold cord an image in human nature of the Holy Trinity.

⁴ XI. 26, 27, 28; cf. XI. 2.

⁵ We find a striking verbal parallelism with St. Augustine's contrast of the two cities in some of the Stoic writings. See especially Seneca, *De Otio*, iv.: 'Duas respublicas animo complectamur, alteram magnam et vere publicam, qua dii atque homines continentur . . . alteram, cui nos adscripsit conditio nascendi;' and compare M. Aurelius, iii. 11: τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πολὶν ὄντα πόλεως τῆς ἀνθρώπων, ἧς αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις ὥσπερ οἰκίαι εἰσὶν, with *De Civ. Dei*, iv. 15, quoted above. For other passages see Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, p. 312. Cf. also Janet, *Histoire de la Science Politique*, i. 250. It is, however, rather to Origen than to the Stoics that we must look for the suggestion of the conception of the

tences as, 'Tantum interest, non qualia sed qualis quisque patiat' (i. 8); 'Mala mors putanda non est, quam bona vita præcesserit' (i. 11); 'Proinde bonus etiamsi serviat, liber est; malus autem etiamsi regnet, servus est, nec unius hominis, sed, quod est gravius, tot dominorum, quot vitiorum' (iv. 3); 'Quid interest sub cuius imperio vivat homo moriturus, si illi qui imperant ad impia et iniqua non cogant?' (v. 17); 'Tolle jactantiam, et omnes homines quid sunt nisi homines' (v. 17), might have been written by Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius. With all his wonderful gentleness and almost passionate tenderness there is in St. Augustine a certain stern common sense, which finds a natural outlet in Stoical forms of thought. Further, the Stoic emphasis on character as what is essential, while external things are ἀδιάφορα, was naturally suggested by the topic which he handled in the earlier part of his work.

But he attacks the Stoic teaching on two main points. The first is its Fatalism. Yet here St. Augustine's aim is not so much to confute the Stoics as to show that their teaching is capable of a rational interpretation, which is not inconsistent with Christianity. With those, indeed, who hold that fate is some inherent order in the stars, independent of the Divine will, he can make no terms. If, however, it is held that the orders of the stars is a revelation of the will of God, and not independent of it, then the question of the truth of divination or astrology becomes a question of fact. For his own part he thinks that the facts are against the astrologers.¹ The deeper Stoic teaching interprets fate as a connexion and order of causes due to the will and power of God, who is rightly believed to have absolute foreknowledge. And here St. Augustine is ready to side with the Stoics as against Cicero's proposal to sacrifice the Divine foreknowledge to human freedom. Cicero's position is the more dangerous of the two, for it logically leads to atheism. But the Christian does not find the two truths inconsistent with one another. Our wills form part of the chain of causes which is clear to God's foreknowledge. For to Him there is no past, present, or future, but all is spread out before Him in one timeless present.² Nor is there any difficulty in regarding human volition as entering into causation, because in the ultimate analysis all cause may be traced back to will, either the will of God or of

City of God to Augustine's mind. See an interesting collection of quotations from Origen in Reuter, *Augustinische Studien*, p. 130, n. 4.

¹ V. 1-7; see especially chap. 2 for his preference of the scientific explanation.

² XI. 21.

spirits
of God
causati
omniun
And it
knowle
without
govern
to thos
with th
signific

On
with th
that th
that th
that he

But, al
their id
of the
cluding
then in
fears, c
runs th
anxiety
Himse
as His
passion
grief, v
lead a
passion
pervers
the cor
quillity
quia st

Wi
touch

¹ V.
liberum
unde sa
² IX
⁴ Th
Platonis
shows a
translat

spirits good or bad, or of men. All power resides in the will of God, and the power to act and so to affect the chain of causation in other wills is derivative from Him. He is *omnium potestatum dator*, though not *omnium voluntatum*. And it is thus that His omnipotence as well as His foreknowledge is consistent with human freedom. For will without power is still will, though ineffective will. And God governs the world by regulating the powers which He grants to those having will. So human freedom is not inconsistent with the foreknowledge of God, by whose aid we are, or, as he significantly adds, we shall be, free.¹

On the practical side St. Augustine has a deeper quarrel with the Stoic doctrine of Apathy. He points out, indeed, that the Stoics do not mean as much as they say. They say that the wise man is free from human passions. They mean that he does not consent to those passions which affect him—

‘Mens immota manet, lacrimæ volvuntur inanes.’²

But, allowing for this exaggeration of phrase, it remains that their ideal is the absolute repression of passion. It is not that of the Christian. The Christian has all the affections, even including sadness (*tristitia*), but he has them set aright. And then in a noble passage St. Augustine shows how the Christian fears, desires, sorrows, rejoices to be tempted; how St. Paul runs through the whole range of human passion in his pressing anxiety for those whom he has won for Christ, how our Lord Himself willed to show human passions which were as real as His real body and His real soul. Even if we believe that the passions, at least fear (so far as inconsistent with love) and grief, will pass away in the life to come, yet here we cannot lead a true life without them. It is not the existence of passion, as such, which shakes human society, but its morbid perversions. Those who hope to do without affections lose the completeness of their humanity without gaining true tranquillity. ‘Non enim quia durum aliquid, ideo rectum, aut quia stupidum est, ideo sanum.’³

With the Platonic School St. Augustine was in closer touch than with the Stoic.⁴ He had never himself passed

¹ V. 1, 8–11. Cf. XIV. 11: ‘Arbitrium igitur voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitii peccatisque non servit. . . . Inde quippe liberator, unde salvator.’

² IX. 4.

³ XIV. 9.

⁴ The Platonic School included of course for St. Augustine the Neo-Platonists. The only dialogue of Plato with which the *De Civitate Dei* shows any general acquaintance is the *Timæus*, which he read in Cicero's translation (xiii. 16), and from which he quotes frequently. The refer-

through a Stoic stage, though, as we have seen, there was a side of Stoicism which had a great attraction for him, and which left marked traces on his language. But the study of Platonism had been the means through which, on the side of the intellect though not of the will, he had been brought to Christianity. His thought retained large and important Platonic elements to the end of his life. Accordingly he approaches the Platonists with expressions of the most profound respect, as the noblest of the philosophers, who hold with us the immortality of the soul and the creation and governance of the world by the one true God.¹ He contrasts their firm hold on the personality of God with that materialist pantheism which dissolved God in the world. It is true that Plato himself wavers in his doctrine of God, but those who understand him best believe that God is the ultimate Cause, the supreme Reason, and the End of human action—the Source of all being, of all knowledge, and of all goodness.² God is the Source of all being; for God's being alone is simple and unchangeable. In Him is no distinction of substance and attribute, of being and life. 'Quod habet, hoc est.'³ He is the supreme Reason, for in Him are all the types or forms of the intelligible world. To Him they mount up, for from Him they spring. And thus He blesses the rational soul of man with participation in His own changeless and spiritual light.⁴ He is the End of all action, for human happiness lies not in the fruition of body or of soul, but of God. Thus the true philosopher, since philosophy aims at a blessed life, is the lover of God.⁵

All this St. Augustine gladly welcomes and makes his own. In strange juxtaposition to the Roman and legal conception of God as omnipotent Will, on which Augustine's predestinarianism rested,⁶ we find the Platonic conception of God as omniscient Reason. Passages in the other dialogues are such as would be consistent with his having gleaned them from allusions in Neo-Platonic and other writings. Of the Neo-Platonists he shows a considerable acquaintance with Plotinus, and with Apuleius of his own Madaura, and a more limited acquaintance with Porphyry. Iamblichus he mentions once (viii. 12).

¹ I. 36; VIII. 1.

² 'Finis omnium actionum, causa omnium naturarum, lumen omnium rationum'; or again, 'causa subsistendi, ratio intelligendi, ordo vivendi' (viii. 4).

³ VIII. 6; XI. 10.

⁴ VIII. 1-7; X. 2; XI. 10.

⁵ VIII. 8. Cf. VIII. 1, 'Porro si sapientia Deus est . . . verus philosophus est amator Dei.'

⁶ On Augustine's predestinarianism as the logical consequence of his view of the preservation of the world as a continual creation out of nothing, see Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, i. 276, and *De Civitate Dei*, xii. 26.

God
conn
hint
love
reas
good
true
etern
bega
infrin
Plato
had
A
of fr
Inca
'In
the
diffic
anth
clog
recti
from
bless
foun
poin
wors
poin
good
cloa
char
of th
the
inclu
body
thes
with
Chri
1
perv
2
and
3
whol
ii. ap
4

God as the supreme Reason and the Goal of all desire. The connexion of the two sides is not worked out, but a significant hint is given us in the identification of the good will with the love of God.¹ Further, he falls back on Plato's account of the reason of creation—that God made the world because He was good—as against the implicit Manichæism of Origen.² It is true that he cannot accept the Neo-Platonist teaching as to the eternity of the world's existence. He must rather say that it began with time than that it was eternal, lest he seem to infringe on God's omnipotence. But here he can appeal to Plato as against his followers. Plato holds that the world had a beginning in time.³

All his differences with the Platonists are as the differences of friends, save two. The first is as to the acceptance of the Incarnation. The Platonists are willing enough to admit the 'In the beginning was the Word;' they are not willing to take the further step, 'and the Word was made flesh.' The difficulty is due partly to pride, partly to that imperfect anthropology which regards the body as a hindrance and clog to the soul. Thus the Platonists stumble over the resurrection from the dead and look to the liberation of the soul from the body and its return naked unto God as its highest blessedness. In their thought, as in Origen's, there are to be found traces of Manichæism.⁴ St. Augustine's second essential point of difference with the Platonists is as to the polytheistic worship which they permitted to themselves and others. He points out that by speaking of the gods of their worship as good dæmons or heavenly powers or created gods, they only cloak their inconsistency; defends the Christians against a charge of exalting the martyrs to a similar position; and in one of the finest passages of the book applies the symbolism of the altar to illustrate the Christian conception of worship as including every work of charity or pity, every discipline of the body, every offering up of the soul, provided that each of these is wrought for the love of God.⁵

It seems to have struck St. Augustine that his friendship with the Platonists might be a stumbling-block to the plain Christian ('homo Christianus litteris tantum ecclesiasticis

¹ XII. 9, XIV. 7: 'Recta itaque voluntas est bonus amor et voluntas perversa malus amor.'

² XI. 21, 23. St. Augustine's cosmology steers clear alike of Dualism and of Pantheism. Cf. Erdmann, i. 274.

³ X. 31; XI. 4-6; XII. 10-17. For an admirable discussion of the whole question compare Saisset, *Modern Pantheism* (Eng. trans.), vol. ii. app. ii., 'Christianity and Platonism.'

⁴ X. 29; XIII. 16-19; XIV. 5.

⁵ VIII. 12-24, 27; X. 3-6.

eruditus'). He gives him some advice as to his attitude towards philosophy. First, let him beware of materialist philosophers. Secondly, let him remember that not all philosophers are materialists. But, thirdly, let him not accept without question all that even non-materialist philosophers teach. He then goes on to discuss the question how it was that Plato came so near Christianity, and concludes that he was probably acquainted with the Pentateuch, but for reasons that are insufficient.¹ It is probably not so much in these considerations that the plain Christian would find satisfaction, as in the sharply marked contrast between the two cities, between the City of God and the city of this world.

III. This contrast is the leading motive of the *De Civitate Dei*. The apologetic interest was strong in St. Augustine's mind when he wrote it. Thus the City of God is identified with the historical Christian Church, including its anticipation in the Jewish commonwealth. The city of this world has its origin on earth with the fratricide Cain; it has its complete manifestation, its *caput*, in the historical Roman Empire.²

But, as Reuter points out in the able and exhaustive study whose title appears at the head of this article, the antithesis between the two cities takes a different colour as the work goes on.³ Augustine's strong predestinarian tendency leads him to conceive the City of God as the society of the elect, and *per contra* the city of this world as the society of the reprobate, whether members of the historical Christian Church or not. The earlier meaning of the contrast is never wholly lost, but it is blurred and dimmed by the later.

He teaches that true religion is not limited to the Christian Church since the Incarnation. True religion, and therefore the Christian religion, which alone is true, has existed from the beginning of time. It was made known by angels to those whom God chose. And thus, through faith in the 'sacrament' of the Incarnation, the Hebrew patriarchs were able to lead good lives.⁴ But the knowledge of the true religion was not limited to the Hebrew race. The Hebrews were the only people of God; but there were also individuals who, though not Israelites by blood, yet belonged to the true Israelites and to the City of God. One of these was Job.⁵ Even the Erythraean Sibyl is to be reckoned among those who were members of the heavenly city.⁶ So much for the past. As regards the present we must never forget that, among those who are now enemies of the City of God, there lie

¹ VIII. 10, 11.² XV. 1, 5.³ Reuter, p. 128.⁴ VII. 32; cf. X. 32.⁵ XVIII. 47.⁶ XVIII. 23.

hid, unknown even to themselves, its future citizens; while within the Church there are those who share her sacraments, who remain in her communion even to the end of their lives, but who yet are not to be reckoned as members of Christ nor as of the number of the elect.¹ Thus the two cities are at present commingled; their mutual limits are not known to men; many are passing from one to the other.² If the same principle which is applied to the cases of Job and of the Erythræan Sibyl in the past were applied to the present, it would follow that, even since the Incarnation, there may be some outside the Church who are saved by the grace of God working through the imperfect *sacramenta* of lower religions, since Christ is for them yet to come. This conclusion is not expressly drawn by Augustine, but it would agree with the passage in the fifteenth book in which he speaks of the societies of those who live 'secundum Deum' and 'secundum hominem' as *mystically* called two cities, the one predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to undergo eternal punishment with the evil one.³ In this passage the predestinarian and mystical conception of the relations of the two cities has full and free course.

But this is exceptional. Throughout the work the mystical and predestinarian is crossed by the historical and apologetic conception. St. Augustine is well aware that heathenish elements remain within the Church, and that many at present without are better than those within. But he wishes to exhibit in one startling contrast the working of the Christian spirit and the working of the spirit opposed to Christianity. To do this he must generalise and neglect the finer lines of cross division.⁴ Further, being a Roman in spite of his African fervour of temperament, he must make his contrast effective by exhibiting it on an historical canvas, and so showing its actual results in the region of facts. But the relations between the Christian Church and the Roman world-power as existing in his own time do not readily lend themselves to his purpose. It is a significant fact that Constantine is only twice mentioned in the work.⁵ So he represents heathendom and the heathen world-state as he imagines it in the past, before contact with Christianity had in some degree redeemed its morals and purified its standards of life.⁶

The desire to sharpen his contrast appears in a very marked form in his discussion of the nature of the State in

¹ I. 35; XVIII. 48, 49, 51; XXI. 25.

² X. 32; XI. 1.

³ XV. 1.

⁴ See especially I. preface, XVIII. 2.

⁵ V. 21, 25.

⁶ Reuter, p. 125.

book xix. We are shown that the true end of all social union, whether in Family, State, or Church, is peace. We are thus prepared for a treatment of all three which will assign to each the duty of maintaining a specific kind of peace, and so a distinct place in the natural order of the world. Accordingly we learn that the duties of the Family spring from the law of God and are in accordance with His will. The Christian or redeemed Family has two characteristic traits. Firstly, those who govern provide that those under their care shall be trained in the love and worship of the true God; and secondly, the motive of their government is not the lust of rule, but the duty of service to those with whom they are brought by nature, or by the customs of human society, into the closest relations. These are the marks of the redeemed Family, and the redeemed Family is the natural Family. 'Hoc naturalis ordo præscribit, ita Deus hominem condidit.'¹

Hints towards a similar treatment of the State may be found here and there in the *De Civitate Dei*. St. Augustine will not adopt Cicero's definition, by which only that community is called a State which is ruled by justice; for this would be to exclude all existing States from the name of State.² He will call them in some sense States, in agreement with the principle he states elsewhere: 'Nullius quippe vitium ita contra naturam est, ut naturæ deleat etiam extrema vestigia.'³ Further, if the States and rulers of the earth would adopt the moral precepts of Christianity the result would be that they would both enjoy in the present life true happiness, and would also ascend up to heaven to reign in eternity.⁴ In other words, the State is *capable* of redemption, although actual States reject Christian teaching. Such would also be the drift of the passage in which he describes the true character of the Christian Emperor, if—which is doubtful—we can regard the Christian Emperor as representative of the Christian State.⁵ But at all events his saying already mentioned, that, if justice had prevailed among men, the resulting order of human society would have been a number of small States at peace with one another, like the many houses in one city,⁶ implies that the State has its place in the *naturalis ordo*. His conception here seems to be that, in the true or redeemed or natural order of earthly society, States would be of a patriarchal or family character. Nor would this exclude the

¹ XIX. 13-15.² II. 21.³ XIX. 12.⁴ II. 19.⁵ V. 24; Reuter, p. 142.⁶ IV. 15; cf. IV. 34, of the Jews: 'Si non in eum peccassent . . . in eodem regno etsi non spatiosiore, tamen feliciore mansissent.'

use
purp
fami
fami
the l
natu

I
main
The
perv
virtu
tion.
seco
infrin
of re
State
only
the S
ends
St. P

P
itself
it lea
peac
more
State
the p
perfe
reali
illust
is to
a cor
came
the s
ing
neve
haza
appo
Aug

1
4
7
9
94; J
10

use of force; for punishment for corrective and deterrent purposes is lawful even in the Family.¹ Lastly, since the family is relative to the State, and the government of the family ought to be so regulated as to be in agreement with the laws of the State, it would follow that the redeemed or natural Family would require the redeemed or natural State.²

But this is not the view of the State, which represents the main drift of book xix. or of the *De Civitate Dei* as a whole. The State is made to appear not as part of the natural order perverted by human sin, but as itself the outcome of sin. Its virtues are vices. Its inspiring motive is the lust of domination.³ It is no doubt in a certain sense natural, but only in a secondary sense, as the assertion of the consequences of the infringement of nature.⁴ Nor can it be regarded as capable of redemption; for, if there were no sin, there would be no State. The City of God may use it, even must use it, but only as an inferior tool where no better is to be had.⁵ Thus the State sinks altogether from being a society having moral ends: we have gone a very long way from the teaching of St. Paul, that 'the powers that be are ordained of God.'

But the effect of this view of the State does not end in itself; it reacts on the view of the Church. On the one hand it leads to a semi-Stoical abdication of responsibility for earthly peace and earthly rule.⁶ On the other hand—and this is a far more serious result—the Church is forced, in the failure of a State which is part of the true natural order, to assume herself the position and functions of the State. The mark of the perfect State is *vera justitia*, but yet true justice is only realized in the Church.⁷ St. Paul had used the State as an illustration of the Church,⁸ but the drift of the *De Civitate Dei* is to exhibit the Church as an *alternative* to the State. Such a conception degrades the Church, and the degradation became apparent in St. Augustine's acceptance in later life of the strong arm of the secular power as an instrument of spreading Christianity.⁹ In claiming for the Church that which never ought to be claimed he loses for it that which at all hazards ought to be kept. It is true that Reuter's warning is apposite.¹⁰ We must not judge Augustine by subsequent Augustinianism or by what is ascribed to him by his foes.

¹ XIX. 16.² XIX. 16.³ XIV. 15.⁴ XIX. 13.⁵ XIX. 17.⁶ II. 19; IV. 3; V. 19.⁷ II. 21.⁸ Phil. iii. 20.⁹ See Dubief, *Essai sur les idées politiques de S. Augustin*, pp. 85-94; Janet, *Histoire de la Science Politique*, i. 305-9.¹⁰ Reuter, p. 101 n.

Augustinian theories of the Church are often not those of Augustine. But yet in his strong desire to frame an effective indictment against paganism, and to show that the Christian Church can provide men with all they need, St. Augustine was led to points of view which, in separation from the ideas which in him corrected them, admitted of logical development into the Roman conception of the Church with its force associations, its temporal power, and its highly centralised absolutism.

We may regret this, but it must not make us unfair to St. Augustine. Interpenetrating this order of ideas, and lying behind them, is his predestinarianism. How closely the two are united may be seen by examining the passage which is the starting-point of Reuter's study. After speaking of the Church as the kingdom of God here on earth St. Augustine goes on to explain that it is the saints who reign. 'Regnant cum Illo, qui eo modo sunt in regno Ejus, ut sint etiam ipsi regnum Ejus.' And then he passes, as it seems without an effort, to explain the 'thrones' of Rev. xx. 4 as referring to the bishops who now govern the Church.¹ Reuter explains this last paragraph as interlarded, in consequence of an exegetical necessity, into a passage of a contrary drift.² But surely the paradox of St. Augustine's great work is that the two lines of thought are welded into one compact whole. Those who are led by the grace of God are, in St. Augustine's view, those who do as a matter of fact find their way into the Christian Church. Speaking broadly, the Church is the communion of the saints. The Christian ideal of life and the Christian conception of the universe stand so far above all other ways of life and all other philosophies that to reject them is deliberately to choose the lower path, and so to separate oneself from Him who is the supreme Goal of human desire and human thought. It is the combination of this emphatic realism with a deep vein of mysticism which is the distinctive note of the *De Civitate Dei*.

¹ XX. 9.

² Reuter, p. 119.

In D.

THE
Stanl
satisf
wheth
appea
Histo
tract
whils
roma
Euro
onsla
atten
of the
siasti
perha
rathe
prom
and
seem
for th
descr
sently
Mr. S
nent
depos
Euro
some
binde
Afric
and I
only
paper
the r
on th

ART. III.—IN DARKEST AFRICA.

In Darkest Africa: or the Quest, Rescue, and Retreat of Emin, Governor of Equatoria. By HENRY M. STANLEY, D.C.L. Oxon., LL.D. Edin., &c. Author of *How I Found Livingstone*; *Through the Dark Continent*; *The Congo, and the Founding of its Free State*; *Coomassie and Magdala*, &c. With 150 Woodcut Illustrations and Maps. Two volumes. (London, 1890.)

THE highest expectations which had been formed of Mr. Stanley's account of his latest African expedition are amply satisfied by these two handsome volumes. We question whether an equal amount of interest has been felt in the appearance of any book since the publication of Macaulay's *History*. The world-wide reputation of the author; the protracted silence in which his proceedings were enshrouded whilst all Europe and America were eager for tidings; the romance which encircled his gallant effort to rescue the last European lieutenant of the Khedive from the ruthless onslaught of the Mahdi; the concentrated and breathless attention of so many civilized States upon the future destinies of the dark continent: all these combined to kindle an enthusiastic interest in Mr. Stanley's fortunes such as has seldom, perhaps never, had its parallel. This interest was enhanced rather than lessened by such news as from time to time was promulgated about the success and return of the expedition, and the appetite, which successive telegraphic messages seemed rather to sharpen than to satiate, keenly hungered for the full feast of romantic adventure which should be described by Mr. Stanley's practised and familiar pen. Presently rumour detailed how the friendship or eagerness of Mr. Stanley's publisher had sent him across an entire continent to meet the returning traveller, and receive the precious deposit of his story. How the first lithographic artists in Europe have exhausted their skill in illustrating, and how some amongst the foremost of London printers and bookbinders have been strained to the utmost to usher *In Darkest Africa* into light—is not all this duly recorded in the 'Author's and Publishers' Note' at the head of the first volume? It is only just to say that workmanship of the very best kind—paper, type, illustrations, maps, these latter especially being the result of unwearied and skilful labour—has been lavished on these volumes, notwithstanding what its author and pub-

lishers call 'the extraordinary and unprecedented demand for it.' The occasion is unique, the heroism of the actors above suspicion, the enterprise of the publishers unquestionable, the glory of all alike untarnished, save by a faint suspicion that there is perhaps too eager a demand for what it had been more graceful to allow others voluntarily to concede. If something of this spirit slightly colours the whole story, and the reader is too often reminded in the narration that of these doughty deeds *pars magna fui*, he readily acquiesces in the plea that all men will occasionally betray the defects of their qualities. The absolute necessity of self-assertion, inseparable from the successful conduct of such an enterprise as the rescue of Emin, will unconsciously tinge the style and temper of Mr. Stanley's writing.

Another and more serious blot consists in the inordinate length of *In Darkest Africa*. Eleven hundred closely printed octavo pages form an excessive task in our busy, hurried lives. It is not that the task lacks variety. It includes varied elements of pathos, serious narrative, and humour; but much might have been omitted and more should have been condensed. Considering the frantic haste with which it was written off, the author working continuously for fifty days, and averaging over twenty printed pages a day, it is a *tour de force* of sustained vigour and singular clearness. But it is diffuse, and at times scrappy and sloppy. Public impatience is no doubt chiefly blameable for these defects, and Mr. Stanley could plead, as Dr. South did with Queen Anne, 'If your Majesty had given me longer time I would have preached a shorter sermon.'

A preparatory letter, appropriately addressed to Sir William Mackinnon, gives a rapid sketch of the circumstances which led to the perilous isolation of Emin Pasha. The whole story embraces details as marvellous and as evanescent as the fables of the *Arabian Nights*. The wild colonization schemes of the Khedive Ismail, which led to the attempt to grasp an entire continent with the aid of European gold; the sudden creation of a race of vice-consuls wielding more than despotic authority, and recruited from the ranks of German apothecaries, the mates of English merchantmen, and cosmopolitan soldiers of fortune; the caprice of fortune which enlisted men of such varied antecedents as Hicks and Stanley, Valentine Baker and Colonel Gordon under the same foreign flag; the incongruous mixture of European and Egyptian elements, of which the latter neutralized and undermined all that the former endeavoured to consolidate: such

are t
Cen
caus
Gove
vast
asun
idea
they
admi
the r
Thes
tinuo
flame
usual
The f
to the
Europ
the s
Gorde
A
speed
mand
and p
scores
vices,
pound
moder
gallan
his co
suppo
enter
but on
under
Stairs
the ob
It was
perform
and ba
to car
record
this in
beads,
necess
supply
to rem

are the materials out of which the drama of Egyptian rule in Central Africa is composed. Mr. Stanley vividly depicts the causes which led to the complete collapse of the Egyptian Government. Its officers were commissioned to occupy so vast a territory that their fortresses were scattered 500 miles asunder. They were supported by subordinates whose only idea of government was to confiscate all native property they could lay hands on. Every additional underling in the administration meant additional plunder of the natives, and the ruling section lacked solidarity and mutual sympathy. These facts sufficiently explain the rapid advance and continuous success of the Mahdi. Fanaticism only fanned the flames of a hatred which the sense of oppression and the usual savage and reckless desire for changes had engendered. The fall of Khartoum and of Gordon—which stung England to the quick—gave Englishmen an eager concern for the one European governor and his Egyptian following, who was now the sole survivor of lofty hopes and Quixotic rashness. Gordon had been sacrificed. Emin might yet be saved.

Ample funds for the outfit of the relief expedition were speedily forthcoming, and Mr. Stanley secured as its commander. Prosaic details of indispensable pounds, shillings, and pence become almost sublime as we learn that not only scores of gallant men volunteered priceless and unpaid services, but that some of those selected actually gave a thousand pounds for the chance of throwing away their lives in this modern crusade. The staff was composed of picked men, gallant, enthusiastic, devoted, loyal. Mr. Stanley's praise of his comrades is cordial and unstinted. Never was general supported by more faithful officers. We need not at present enter upon the mysterious inaction which proved fatal, with but one exception, to those who were left with the rearguard under Major Barttelot at Stanley Falls; but of the remainder, Stairs, Nelson, Jephson, Dr. Parke, all happily returned when the object of the expedition had been successfully compassed. It was estimated that eighteen months would be consumed in performing the journey from Zanzibar to the Albert Nyanza and back, and that from 600 to 800 porters would be required to carry the baggage. Those who are familiar with the records of African travel will feel no surprise on learning that this included more than 27,000 yards of cloth, 3,600 lbs. of beads, and a ton of brass, copper, and iron wire. Besides necessary ammunition and artillery for the journey, a further supply was provided to strengthen Emin Pasha if he decided to remain in Equatoria; and among the specialities were a

Maxim automatic gun, a steel boat twenty-eight feet long, built in sections so as to be carried overland, and tents made of canvas dipped in sulphate of copper, which effectually preserved them for three years against 300 days of tropical rain.

Long and anxious discussion necessarily preceded the determination of a route to the Albert Nyanza. Mr. Stanley's own choice of proceeding by the Congo river was eventually adopted, but not without some vacillation which cost the expedition dear. A flotilla of whale-boats had been ordered and countermanded, and the expected aid promised by King Leopold of the Belgian steam navy proved a complete failure. To sail from Zanzibar to the Congo river might seem an extraordinary decision, but abundant state reasons justified the selection of this route, and, more than all, the Zanzibari porters were less likely to desert at so great a distance from home. After animated discussion with the authorities, and armed with precise instructions and full powers from the Khedive; after the usual delays and disappointments at Zanzibar, and some severe skirmishing between the Zanzibari and the Soudanese on board the *Madura*; after long deliberation and a solemn compact with Tippu Tib, every article of which the renowned Arab deliberately violated; after a hurried interview with two of the Executive Committee charged with the administration of the Congo State, the expedition started—with what prospects Mr. Stanley shall describe in his own words:

"We had but time to exchange a few words, but in that short time they managed to inform me that there was "a famine in the country," that "the villages along the road to the Pool were abandoned;" that the "*Stanley* was seriously damaged;" that "the mission steamers *Peace* and *Henry Reed* were in some unknown parts of the Upper Congo;" that "the *En Avant* was ashore without machinery or boiler;" that "the *A.I.A.* was 300 miles above Stanley Pool;" and that "the *Royal* was perfectly rotten," and had not been employed for a year; in fact, that the whole of the naval stock promised did not exist at all except in the imagination of the gentlemen of the Bureau at Brussels. . . .

"My thoughts were not of the pleasantest. With my flotilla of fifteen whale boats I might have been independent; but there was an objection to the Congo route, and therefore that plan was abandoned. We had no sooner adopted the East Coast route than the sovereign of the Congo State invited the Expedition to pass through his territory; the Germans had murmured, and the French Government protested at the idea of our marching through East Africa. When it was too late to order the flotilla of whale boats from Forrest

and
trans
the l
to be
acce
may
of Ju
and l
the a
have
our l
right

A
can a
the n
para
His
tellig
Ten
of th
serrie
Zanz
picio
ignor
the s
their
desp
strag
indef
mom
faith
throu
hove
for t
malin
of pu
we p
gift o
auth
their
some
expe
Soud
heat
petua
VO

and Son, we then accepted the Congo route, after stipulating for transport up the Lower Congo, for portorage to Stanley Pool, and the loan of the steamers on the Upper Congo, which were now said to be wrecked, rotten, or without boilers or engines, or scattered inaccessible. In my ears rang the cry in England: "Hurry up, or you may be too late!" and singing through my memory were the words of Junker: "Emin will be lost unless immediate aid be given him;" and Emin's appeal for help: for, if denied, "we shall perish." Well, the aspect of our work is ominous. It is not my fault, and what we have to do is simple enough. We have given our promise to strive our level best. It is no time for regret, but to struggle and steer right onward' (i. 76, 77).

A certain detachment of mind is requisite before the reader can adequately comprehend Stanley's position at the head of the relieving force. The pages of classic history suggest no parallel to the conditions of his march through Darkest Africa. His men lacked the bond of common patriotism, and the intelligent apprehension of a common danger which united the Ten Thousand in their retreat, as well as the perfect discipline of the Tenth Legion under Cæsar in the forests or before the serried hosts of Gaul. A mingled and undisciplined band of Zanzibaris, Soudanese, and Somalis, severed by mutual suspicion and contempt, swayed by the reckless imprudence and ignorance that are characteristic of savage races, heedless of the sternest orders, prompted though they were by regard for their own safety. At one time squandering a week's rations despite solemn warnings and experience of famine; at another straggling idly from the ranks to be cut off by hidden yet indefatigable foes; at another forfeiting by desertion, at some momentary impulse, the wages earned by weeks of toilsome, faithful service—how was it possible to lead such a horde through pathless forests, with a watchful and crafty enemy hovering upon flank and rear? There was no time to spare for the gradual weeding out, or reduction to order, of malingeringers. There was no little danger that excess or defect of punishment would wreck the entire expedition. The more we ponder it, the more striking does that innate indescribable gift of generalship appear which enabled Stanley to acquire authority over such a following. At the commencement of their march the prospect was simply appalling. Every day some men were missing or some thefts were reported. The expedition straggled in the most disheartening manner. The Soudanese were in bad temper, the Zanzibari prostrate with heat and unequal to their burdens, and the two parties perpetually quarrelling until a considerable distance was kept

between them. The caravan set out from Mataddi for Stanley Pool on March 22, 1887, and by April 6 Mr. Stanley was struck with the increase of demoralization in his company. A fortnight later a hundred men were useless as soldiers or carriers. Infinite forbearance and tact were needed to determine when to be lenient and when to enforce discipline by blows. 'During these days the Soudanese were uncommonly provoking. Job would have waxed wrathful and become profane' (i. 50).

From Stanley Pool to Yambuya, on the Upper Congo—a river voyage of 1,100 miles—was accomplished without further incident than the detentions with which crazy steamers varied the ordinary slowness of their progress. But as the force could not be transported in one voyage upon the ships which alone were available, it was determined that the healthiest should proceed to Yambuya, and that Major Barttelot with 125 men should be left as a rear-guard at Bolobo, 'to fatten upon the bananas and excellent native bread and fish that abounded there.' At Major Barttelot's own request Mr. Jameson was appointed second in command, with Messrs. Toup, Ward, and Bonny as subalterns. Tippu Tib had engaged to supply sufficient porters for the rear-guard within a few days of his own arrival at Yambuya, but it was definitely arranged that in the event of his failure to do this—which both Mr. Stanley and Major Barttelot strongly suspected—the rear-guard was to move on in the track of the expedition as soon as the column could be got together.

It is idle to speculate whether any further light will ever be cast upon the causes which led to the delay and the decimating of the rear-guard. As it stands, the mystery of its inaction is inexplicable. Mr. Stanley's instructions—they are too long for quotation *in extenso*—were explicit.

'The interests,' he wrote, 'now entrusted to you are of vital importance to this Expedition. The men you will eventually have under you consist of more than an entire third of the Expedition. The goods that will be brought up are the currency needed for transit through the regions beyond the Lakes; there will be a vast store of ammunition and provisions, which are of equal importance to us. The loss of these men and goods would be certain ruin to us, and the Advance Force itself would need to solicit relief in its turn' (i. 115).

The instructions are dated June 24. Unless Tippu Tib's carriers arrived by the middle of August, the Major was to press on in Stanley's track as best he could.

From Yambuya the expedition was to travel in a straight

line,
path
Bart
Mr.

far th
kind
have
sum
I hav
Nyar
720
Nyar
1874
in I
54 d
road
will
hun
Let
that
after
Tib
(i. 1

forc
nati
Eur
exp
shal
Afr
For
thei
desc
stri
sole
ope
teri
the
clair
othe
sprin
of th
the
pion

line, steering by the compass, for the Albert Nyanza. Its path lay through primeval forest, and in reply to Major Barttelot's enquiry how long it would be before they met, Mr. Stanley drew the following picture of his journey.

'God knows! None can inform me what lies ahead here, or how far the forest extends inland. Whether there are any roads, or what kind of natives, cannibals, incorrigible savages, dwarfs, gorillas. I have not the least idea. I wish I had, and would give a handsome sum for the knowledge even. But that paper in your hand, on which I have calculated how long it will take me to march to the Albert Nyanza, is based on this fact. In 1874 and 1875 I travelled 720 miles in 103 days. The distance from here to the Albert Nyanza is about 330 geographical miles in a straight line. Well, in 1874-75 I travelled 330 geographical miles—Bagamoyo to Vinyata, in Ituru, in 64 days; from Lake Uhimba to Ujiji, 330 miles, in 54 days. These were, of course, open countries, with tolerably fair roads, whereas this is absolutely unknown. Is it all a forest?—then it will be an awful work. How far does the forest reach inland? A hundred—two hundred—three hundred miles? There is no answer. Let us assume we can do the journey to the Albert in three months; that I am detained a fortnight, and that I am back in three months afterwards. Well, I shall meet you coming towards me, if Tippu Tib is not with you, the latter part of October or November' (i. 122-3).

On June 28 the march to Yambuya commenced. The force under Stanley's personal command consisted of 383 native men and boys, four other English officers, and one European servant. As they plunged into the forest they expected to find such a native track—though it were but a shallow, winding gutter—as had been met with in earlier African expeditions. They were soon woefully undeceived. For 160 days—from June 28 to December 5—they had to cut their way through forest, bush, and jungle; and it is to the description of this absolutely unknown region that the most striking chapters of *In Darkest Africa* are devoted. A weird solemnity overhangs the record which discloses the first opening, to the gaze and knowledge of civilized men, of this terrible forest since the waters were gathered together and the dry land appeared. We sympathize with Mr. Stanley's claim upon the reader's patience on the plea that 'there is no other manuscript or missal, printed book or pamphlet, this spring of the year of our Lord 1890 that contains any account of this region of horrors other than this book of mine' (i. 136).

To hew an opening through thicket, briar, and tangle, with the temperature at 86° in the shade, was the task of fifty pioneers, equipped with axes and billhooks. The rate of pro-

gress was necessarily governed by the nature of the undergrowth, so that at one time the march was only 400 yards an hour; at another it might accomplish a full mile. As the route lay parallel to the course of the Aruwimi the column plunged into many a secret rivulet and hidden swamp, where the stench from fetid mud and rotting vegetation was overpowering. Now and again a man would disappear into an elephant-pit; more frequently an arrow from an invisible foe brought down any rash straggler from the close line of the march. For to the depression caused by perpetual sojourn in dismal twilight and the absence of genial sunshine and warmth there was added the eerie sensation that unseen hosts were ever hovering near them. In order to ensure a supply of provisions the expedition carefully followed the tracks leading to native villages whenever they were ascertainable, and at their approach the inhabitants fled, leaving their houses and patches of cultivated ground for the use of the strangers.

Occasionally the savages showed a bolder front, and endeavoured manfully to resist the passage of the expedition through their borders. On the first day of their entrance into the forest Mr. Stanley's party came upon a wide open space, the bushes from which blocked further advance, whilst the natives, with drawn bows, awaited their coming. Soon the scouts discovered that the apparent highway through the bush bristled with skewers sharpened at both ends and slightly covered over with green leaves. Hardly any stratagem proved more harassing than these horrible skewers, whose poisoned barbs pierced through the strongest boots, and the wounds festered into ulcers that were long in healing. Add to the trouble arising from such disasters the misery caused by deluges of tropical rain, which fell in drops as large as dollars on the cotton robes of the Zanzibari, and chilled them to the bone. Roaring tempests crashed through the forest, the forked lightning darted its spiteful tongues and tore down heavy branches, and the very floodgates of heaven seem opened. At the end of forty-four days since leaving Yambuya only a third of the distance to the lake had been covered, and the misery of the force was almost intolerable. They became stupefied by terror,

'woe, sickness, loss of friends, hunger, rain and thunder, and general wretchedness. They might be seen crouching under plantain-leaf sheds, native shields, cotton shelters, straw mats, earthen and copper pots above their heads, even saddles, tent canvas covers, blankets, each body wreathed in blue vapour, self-absorbed with speechless anguish' (i. 181).

T
eng
we q
struc
woul
woul

clear
half i
timbe
clear
princ
way.
first,
then
a few
stem
finds
which
then
walks
soon
when
until
bran
again
foot
until
anoth
feet,
on fo
of the
I hav
gymn
were
feet,
after
with
in the
a clea
quent
a mo
walki
swam
below
men a
some
-creep
thirty

The large settlements so frequently reached in the forest engendered special difficulties which are so characteristic that we quote Mr. Stanley's account at some length. The uninstructed reader would imagine that the clearings, at any rate, would afford an easy passage; but we question whether he would care to try the experiment:—

‘Another peculiarity of the Balessé is the condition of their clearings, and some of these are very extensive, quite a mile and a half in diameter, and the whole strewn with the relics, débris, and timber of the primæval forest. Indeed, I cannot compare a Balessé clearing to anything better than a mighty abattis surrounding the principal village, and over this abattis the traveller has to find his way. As one steps out of the shadow of the forest the path is at first, maybe, along the trunk of a great tree for one hundred feet; it then turns at right angles along a great branch a few feet; he takes a few paces on the soil, then finds himself in front of a massive tree-stem three feet in diameter or so; he climbs over that, and presently finds himself facing the outspreading limbs of another giant, amongst which he must creep, and twist, and crawl to get footing on a branch, then from the branch to the trunk, he takes a half-turn to the right, walks along the tree from which, increasing in thickness, he must soon climb on top of another that has fallen across and atop of it, when after taking a half-turn to the left he must follow, ascending it, until he is twenty feet above the ground. When he has got among the branches at this dizzy height he needs judgment and to be proof against nervousness. After tender, delicate balancing he places his foot on a branch—at last descends cautiously along the steep slope until he is six feet from the ground, from which he must jump on to another tapering branch and follow that to another height of twenty feet, then along the monster tree, then down to the ground; and so on for hours, the hot, burning sun, and the close, steamy atmosphere of the clearing, forcing the perspiration in streams from his body. I have narrowly escaped death three times during these frightful gymnastic exercises. One man died where he fell. Several men were frightfully bruised. Yet it is not so dangerous with the naked feet, but with boots in the early morning, before the dew is dried, or after a rain, or when the advance-guard has smeared the timber with a greasy clay, I have had six falls in an hour. The village stands in the centre. We have often congratulated ourselves on coming to a clearing at the near approach to camping-time; but it has frequently occupied us one hour and a half to reach the village. It is a most curious sight to see a caravan laden with heavy burdens walking over this wreck of a forest, and timbered clearing. Streams, swamps, watercourses, ditches are often twenty to twenty-five feet below a tapering slippery tree, which crosses them bridge-like. Some men are falling, some are tottering, one or two have already fallen, some are twenty feet above the ground, others are on the ground creeping under logs. Many are wandering among a maze of branches; thirty or more may be standing on one delicate and straight shaft, a

few may be posted, like sentries, on a branch, perplexed which way to move. All this, however, is made much harder and more dangerous when, from a hundred points, the deadly arrows are flying from concealed natives, which—thank Heaven!—were not common. We have been too cautious for that kind of work to happen often, though we have seldom been able to leave one of these awful clearings without having some man's foot skewered, or someone lamed² (i. 245, 246).

It must be understood that we are not attempting in this paper to give, even in outline, a description of the sufferings endured in the march through the forest. The land force was accompanied by the steel boat and such canoes as were from time to time procurable, and these had their own moving incidents as they mounted rapids or were dragged up waterfalls on the Aruwimi and the Ituri. As the journey was protracted the wounded and sick were conveyed in the flotilla, and the relief thus afforded was invaluable; but provisions became scarcer, and the increased desertions witnessed the growing despair of the men and probable failure of the campaign. A band of Arab raiders had laid the country desolate, and their vicinity encouraged wholesale plunder and desertion. At the camp of one of their leaders, named Ugarrowwa, abundant food restored the men's spirit once more, but a muster betrayed the fact that out of 389 who had started from Yambuya fifty-six were sick and sixty-two more were lost by death or desertion. One-third of the force was already *hors de combat*, and barely half the distance to the Albert Lake was covered. The sick were left under the charge of Ugarrowwa, and their comrades pushed on.

The next point to be made was a Manyuema settlement belonging to Kilonga-Longa, another great Arab chieftain; but the host mistook the road, and the difficulties, both on the river and through the forest, became more serious than ever. The country had been devastated by the Arab raiders, and every cultivated plot of ground destroyed. Coarse wild fruit, suspicious-looking fungi, at last even leaves and wood, were eagerly devoured, and, to aggravate their misery, the navigation became more laborious as the men grew weaker through famine. On October 6, out of 271 four had perished and three more deserted, whilst of the remainder fifty-two were reduced to skeletons, and could barely crawl. There were only 170 men to carry 227 loads. Captain Nelson, like most of the disabled men, was suffering terribly from ulcers which increased daily in virulence. Was the catastrophe which befell Allen Gardiner about to be repeated on a gigantic

scale? The only hope of preserving their lives lay in once more disencumbering the expedition of the sick, who were left at Starvation Camp, whilst the remainder struggled on towards Ipoto.

The experience of the next few days might have reduced the most stout-hearted to despair. On the 10th, after an absence of thirty-six hours, the foragers returned with sufficient plantains 'to put four ounces of solid stuff into stomachs that would have required eight pounds to satisfy.' It is pathetic to read that under such conditions the officers—Stairs, Jephson, and Parke—amused themselves in drawing up fanciful *menus* in which dainties such as 'filets de bœuf en Chartreuse' and 'petites bouchées aux huîtres' figured with substantial items, such as roast beef unlimited, or ham and eggs and plenty of them. But the utmost extremity of endurance was almost reached. The most loyal were deserting, the bravest were cowed, when the blaze that pointed the road to Ipoto was discovered. Seventy-one men had either died, been killed, or deserted in less than ten days. Of the 200 which survived about fifty were in fair condition; the rest were 'skeletons covered with ugly grey skins, jaded and worn out, with every sign of wretchedness printed deep in their eyes, in their bodies, and movements. They could hardly do more than creep on, and moan, and shed tears, and sigh.' Such was the condition of the host that on October 18 entered the Manyema camp.

We have no space to record how the hearty hospitality of Ipoto speedily declined to a grasping avarice which threatened to strip the entire expedition despite the formal entrance of Ismaili into blood-brotherhood with Stanley. The first care was the relief of those who had been left behind under Captain Nelson, the next to press forward on their quest. We must omit the long indictment which Stanley drew up against the Manyemas, and of the ills which association with them brought in its train. It was absolutely necessary to leave Captain Nelson and thirty other sick men under the charge of Dr. Parke at the camp of these ruthless bandits, so for the present Stanley dissembled his wrath. The march beyond Ipoto, though not without its trials, lay through a land of abundance, and the spirit of the men rose under their altered circumstances. We have already quoted the description of a clearing in the country of Balessé. Yet another month of this toilsome struggling over obstacles and entanglements that baffle description, and their troubles would be almost ended.

On the last of November the caravan was passing through plantations which surrounded the abodes of a powerful tribe, and were beginning to breast a lofty hill, when some of the advanced scouts were seen returning rapidly, and with excited looks. They came to report that the end of the forest had been reached, and that a splendid country lay beyond it. The news soon spread through the column, and the porters hurried forward. The joy of the Ten Thousand at their first glimpse of the sea could not have surpassed the exultation of Mr. Stanley and his devoted band. The promised land was at length in sight and suggested the name of Mount Pisgah for the height that crowned the desired pasture-lands of Equatoria.

'The men crowded up the slope eagerly with inquiring, open-eyed looks, which before they worded their thoughts, we knew meant, "Is it true? Is it no hoax? Can it be possible that we are near the end of this forest-hell?" They were convinced themselves in a few moments after they had dropped their burdens, and regarded the view with wondering and delighted surprise. "Aye, friends, it is true. By the mercy of God, we are well-nigh the end of our prison and dungeon." They held their hands far out yearningly towards the superb land, and each looked up to the bright blue heaven in grateful worship, and after they had gazed as though fascinated, they recovered themselves with a deep sigh, and as they turned their heads, lo! the sable forest heaved away to the infinity of the west, and they shook their clenched hands at it with gestures of defiance and hate. Feverish from sudden exaltation, they apostrophized it for its cruelty to themselves and their kinsmen; they compared it to Hell, they accused it of the murder of one hundred of their comrades, they called it the wilderness of fungi and wood-beans; but the great forest which lay vast as a continent before them, and drowsy, like a great beast, with monstrous fur thinly veiled by vaporous exhalations, answered not a word, but rested in its infinite sullenness, remorseless and implacable as ever' (i. 267-8).

After five months of ceaseless struggle in the dim twilight of the primeval forest there followed another fortnight of hard fighting and harder climbing before the southern shore of the Albert Nyanza was gained. Here was the rendezvous appointed for meeting Emin. But no mark of his presence could be traced, no news even of his ever having visited the spot, no sign of the steamers under his command; not a canoe in which to launch from the barren and inhospitable shore, not even a tree out of which one could be made. Were they to be baffled just as they reached the goal of their long and weary enterprise? Had Emin Pasha not received Stanley's despatches or had he started to cut his way by the east

coast
broug
to hi
back
be sh
they
section

W
the m
parts
The
migh
subje
of th
first m
misce
the r
greet
myria
forme
from
butti
migh
cover
Moun
dwar
tion
rebel
of his
coast
hensi
Pasha
thous
ters t
unflay

If
the f
micro
plagu
forest

'A
cleari
thick,
innun
sides,

coast to Zanzibar? With the stock of ammunition they had brought so far it was hopeless to attempt to fight their way to him at Wadelai. There was nothing for it but to turn back and build a fort where the bulk of the expedition could be sheltered, whilst others returned and brought up the stores they had left in concealment beyond Ipoto, as well as the sections of the steel boat.

With the arrival of the force at the shore of Lake Albert the most thrilling act of the drama closes, but the subsequent parts of Mr. Stanley's work are hardly inferior in interest. The latter part of the first and the whole of the second volume might be fittingly described as a series of episodes whose subject and *dénouement* are singularly varied. The building of the camp at Bodo and the daily life within its walls—the first meeting with Emin Pasha and his strange vacillation and misconception of his own position—Stanley's return to seek the rear-guard, and the inexplicable tale of disaster which greeted his arrival—life in the vast forest with its teeming myriads of insects and its luxuriance of life and foliage, the former of which made its woods resonant with cries uttered from a thousand unseen throats—the unique race of Wambutti pigmies, with their elfish cunning and dexterity that might rival the imps or fairies of legendary story—the discovery and exploration of the snowy range of Ruwenzori, the Mountains of the Moon, whose existence, like that of the dwarf tribes, is now first placed beyond dispute—the deposition and imprisonment of Emin and Mr. Jephson by the rebels in Equatoria—the arrangements for his convoy and that of his 600 Egyptian followers with their journey to the east coast and their safe arrival at Zanzibar—and the incomprehensible indifference (to use no stronger term) of the German Pasha to the heroic Englishmen who had braved death in a thousand forms to save him: each and all these furnish chapters that teem with life and incident, and carry the reader on unflinching through new and stirring scenes.

If life on the march had its full share of miseries, life in the forest was also not without its trials. Rats, fleas, and microscopically small mosquitoes were among the lesser plagues; but, of all living abominations, in the fort and in the forest, the red ants were the most terrible:—

'Armies of them would sometimes invade the fort from the clearing; their columns were not interrupted by the ditch. In long, thick, unbroken lines, guarded by soldiers on either flank, the innumerable insects would descend the ditch and ascend the opposite sides, over the parapets, through the interstices of the poles, over the

banquette, and down into the plaza of the fort, some columns attacking the kitchen, others head-quarters, the officers' mess-house, and woe betide any unlucky naked foot treading upon a myriad. Better a flogging with nettles, or cayenne over an excoriated body, or a caustic bath for a ravenous itch, than these biting and venomous thousands climbing up the limbs and body, burying themselves in the hair of the head, and plunging their shining, horny mandibles into the flesh, creating painful pustules with every bite. Every living thing seems disturbed at their coming. Men are screaming, bellowing with pain, dancing, and writhing. There is a general rustle, as of a host of migrant creatures among the crisp, dry phrynina leaves overhead. The rats and mice, snakes, beetles, and crickets are moving. From a slung cot I have observed, by candle-light, the avengers advancing over the floor of my house, scaling the walls, searching the recesses of every layer of leaves, skirmishing among the nooks and crannies, mouse-holes and cracks; heard moaning and crying of little blind mice, and terrified squealing of motherly and paternal rats, and hailed them as a blessing, encouraging them along their career of destruction, until presently some perverse and undisciplined tribes would drop from the roof on my cot, and convert their well-wisher into a vindictive enemy, who, in his rage, would call aloud for hot glowing embers and roast them alive by thousands, until the air was heavy with the odour of frizzling and frying ants. Bad luck to them !' (i. 334-5).

We have not space to record the sad fate of Major Barttelot nor the horrors of the return journey, which rivalled those experienced on the first march to Lake Albert. The inevitable difficulties of the way were aggravated tenfold by the incorrigible folly of the Zanzibari, who would squander a week's provision at a single meal, or throw down a burden of priceless food on the mere rumour of fresh supplies at the next camping-ground. Yet trials which could be faced and overcome by manly endurance could hardly have been so intolerable to a man of Stanley's temperament as the apathy and indecision of the governor whom he risked so much to save. We had marked a score of passages for quotation, but we forbear.

But who can fail to sympathize with the astonishment of Stanley at the stamp of man to whom the charge of so vast a territory had been assigned? To Emin Pasha's high qualities of tact and temper, to his genuine concern for the welfare of his people, to the ingenuity with which he devised plans for their comfort, to his ability and gentleness, Mr. Stanley bears ample and ungrudging testimony. But the man was at heart a mere naturalist more than aught else—far happier with the scalpel than with the sceptre of command; more deeply interested in the last new-found butterfly than with

the a
throu
has
threa
patie
in stu

V
over
influe
prese
suffe
will
hono
Mac
Wha
shed
Gosp
labor
not p
full v
age,
teste
reco

Blun

Prom
decl
repe
very
and
shou
brat
each
of p
thin
doin
fect

the anxious problem of pioneering an unwieldy host safe through a hostile country. When the folly of his Egyptians has perilled brave men's lives, or their lack of discipline threatened to overwhelm the caravan in ruin, one grows impatient at the apathy which, amidst such dangers, can delight in stuffing birds or dissecting monkeys' skulls.

Whatever future may be in store for the vast continent over which England has acquired so enormous a sphere of influence, and however dark the record which its annals may present of the treatment which its sons in the past have suffered at our hands, there are some names at least which will ever stand out conspicuously as upholding the Christian honour of Great Britain in this nineteenth century. Bishops Mackenzie and Hannington, General Gordon and Miss Whately, and many others might be quoted whose lives have shed the light of heaven over the dark continent and carried Gospel blessings to the sad tents of Ham. Mr. Stanley's labours have been in another and a rougher field, and we may not perhaps approve all that he has done ; but he has earned full well his own place amongst the heroes of our own heroic age, and never has his well-tried gallantry been more keenly tested, or shone with purer radiance, than in the unique exploit recorded in these volumes.

ART. IV.—PIOUS FRAUDS.

Blunders and Forgeries. Historical Essays. By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. (London, 1890.)

PIOUS frauds are mostly of the kind of which Charles Fox declared, in somewhat more forcible language than shall be repeated here, that it is easy enough to see the fraud but very hard to discover the piety. They would form a curious and interesting subject to a student of human nature who should try to examine the history of some of the most celebrated of them, and determine the relative proportions in each case of the piety and the fraud. Probably every variety of proportion would be found to exist, from the piety so unthinking that it never occurs to it to consider the morality of doing evil that good may come, to the fraud which is perfectly self-conscious and intentional, but which works under

the veil of piety. The enquirer would need to be a person of human sympathy, of great penetration into motive, and, above all, of perfect fairness and freedom from prejudice. He would find frauds committed in the interest of every cause and every religion, from the purest to the most degraded, and he would need to keep himself clear of all suspicion of controversial interest if he were to do justice to his subject.

But there is another class of enquirer who has likewise a perfectly legitimate claim to existence, who has a very keen interest in some particular cause, and who consequently wishes to free it from all unfounded and unjust attacks. He will naturally take pleasure in exposing the mistakes of his opponents, and he will display some excusable bitterness in dealing with those misstatements which are worse than blunders. His work will not be of the general human interest which belongs to the other which we have imagined, and it will naturally be read with more satisfaction by those who agree with the main principles and beliefs of the writer than by those who belong to the party against which his attack is directed. But it will still, unless it is itself marked by inaccuracy, be of value to the historian and to every fair-minded man who desires nothing except the victory of truth.

It is a book of the second class whose title stands at the head of this article. It treats, as its name declares, with blunders and forgeries, but the blunders and forgeries are exclusively those which in some way reflect on the character and teaching of the Roman Church. No one would contend that it is a very important work, or an extensive contribution to the literature of Pious Frauds; but though some of the points raised are trivial they are often amusing, and others, which include the more serious part of the volume, are of some gravity. It consists of reprints of articles written for various papers and reviews, and several of them betray their origin by a tone of exaggeration and of controversy which is suitable enough in its place, but detracts from their value for historical purposes. The first part of the volume, which deals with blunders, is the most amusing; the other is the most important. Some of the stories are old, some, so far as we know, are new. Mr. Bridgett is not the first, any more than he will be the last, to extract amusement from that volume of the Rolls Series which contains Mr. F. C. Hingeston's translation of the line relating to the treatment of the body of the Emperor Henry IV.,

'Affra capella fuit quæ patris ossa tulit,'

which
render

And a
'Africa
planat
skin;
she-go
shiver
goats,
peror's
Marien
compr
ings o

Th
thought
who w
dispens
a med
But, a
humor
Dr. L.
Miche
woma
indeed
in tho
shoul
than t
tius F
tine, J
though
health
days.

Th
the pa
The m
two su
affirm
forger
of eco
period
are su
first is
other
Bridg

which Mr. Hingeston, in a moment of unhappy inspiration, renders :

'A *she-goat's skin* receives his father's bones.'

And as Affra must presumably be translated on this theory 'African,' Mr. Bridgett has a right to complain that no explanation is given (1) why the body was wrapped in a goat's skin ; (2) why in a she-goat's skin ; (3) why in an African she-goat's skin. Mr. Hingeston, who probably feels a cold shiver down his back at any reference to Africa or to goats, must wish he had discovered earlier that the emperor's body lay for five years in the chapel of St. Afra in the Marienkirche at Spire (which Mr. Bridgett, apparently as a compromise between the English, French, and German spellings of the name, spells Spiers).

This is the best of the blunders collected by Mr. Bridgett, though the editor who was scandalized at a mediæval vicar who was stated to have two wives and to pretend a papal dispensation for the same, not being aware that 'wives' was a mediæval figure for 'benefices,' is also a pleasing incident. But, as a rule, Mr. Bridgett's hand is a little heavy with his humourisms. It was not necessary to prove ponderously that Dr. Lyon Playfair was not strictly accurate in asserting, after Michelet, that 'for a thousand years there was not a man or woman in Europe that ever took a bath.' Cleanliness did indeed play rather a poor second to godliness in many places in those days, but it was not quite so bad as that, and we should have been prepared to believe him on something less than the evidence of Sidonius Apollinaris, Cassiodorus, Venantius Fortunatus, Alcuin, Bede, Henry of Huntingdon, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, and the wary versifier who thought that baths were a superfluous vanity (though healthy) in March, and altogether to be avoided in the dog-days.

These, however, are trifles, and though suitable enough for the pages of a magazine, are perhaps hardly worth reprinting. The more important section of the work is that which deals with two subjects of some historical notoriety on which Mr. Bridgett affirms the prevailing Anglican view to be based on mere forgeries and criminal negligence as to authorities on the part of ecclesiastical historians. Both relate to the Reformation period, and, though not of fundamental importance, they both are subjects of some interest, and deserve consideration. The first is concerned with the once famous Rood of Boxley, the other with certain documents used by Strype, which Mr. Bridgett believes to have been forged by one Robert Ware.

The Rood of Grace stood in the abbey church of Boxley, and by certain mechanical devices the eyes and limbs of the figure could be moved, so as to give an appearance of life. The one other undisputed fact about it is that in the year 1538, after the surrender of the abbey, the figure was exposed to public derision in the market-place of Maidstone, and again at St. Paul's Cross in London, after which it was destroyed. Protestant historians always speak of the motions of the Rood as intended to impose upon the credulous and uneducated. Mr. Bridgett maintains that there was no imposture, but merely pageantry, of which the nature was known to everyone. The question is very likely one which is open to argument, but Mr. Bridgett's methods are hardly such as to promote sober historical judgment. He begins by quoting various historians, such as Hume, Russell, Dean Hook, and Mr. Froude, with disparaging remarks implying that their statements are based on worthless evidence. He then gives the original evidence, which *prima facie* fully justifies the remarks of these historians, and to this he opposes certain considerations as to the intrinsic probability of the story, backed by very little that can claim the name of evidence. On the question of probability Dean Hook and Mr. Froude have as much right to their opinion as Mr. Bridgett, and there is no stronger *à priori* reason for accusing the one party of prejudice than the other; and Mr. Bridgett gets but a very little way towards justifying a good deal of strong language which is summed up with the assertion that the story of the performing Rood is 'a Lie, a Lie deserving of very conspicuous capitals, but a lie first invented cunningly and knowingly by those first Protestants, and since then manipulated and multiplied and propagated by their successors during three centuries and a half, not indeed with the same full consciousness, yet with blindness and recklessness and eagerness, which are in ill-harmony with such grand professions of devotion to the truth.'

The original evidence (which we quote from Mr. Bridgett, in spite of his fulminations against those who depend on second-hand authority) may be summarized as follows. Jeffrey Chambers, one of Cromwell's commissioners for the suppression of the monasteries, writes to his master in February 1538:—

'Upon the defacing of the late monasterye of Boxley, and plucking down of the images of the same, I found in the Image of the Roode of Grace, the which heretofore hath ben hadde in great veneration of people, certen ingynes and olde wyer with olde roton

stykes in
to move
And also
speke.
that was

He ad
of the
market-
see the
honour
a conte
that 'it
hair, wh
till now

'Also
stone, an
the eyes
that had
of many
riches in
moved b
contrary.

As t
shows th
that th
which t
machine
dence w
does not
Kent, in
lic docu
ingeniou
itself, to
to roll t
finally t
member
show of
rates ho
miracle,
'abused
manner
sort be y
Cross, an
common
Thes

stykes in the back of the same that dyd cause the eyes of the same to move and sterve in the hede thereof lyke unto a lyvelye thyng. And also the nether lippe in lykewise to move as though it shulde speke. Which so founde was nott a litle strange to me and other that was present at the pluckinge downe of the same.'

He adds that the abbot and monks denied all knowledge of the machinery, and that he exhibited the Rood in the market-place of Maidstone to the people there present, 'to see the false, crafty, and sottile handelyng thereof, to the dishonour of God and illusion of the sayd people.' Wriothesley, a contemporary, mentions the removal of the Rood, saying that 'it was made to move the eyes and lips by strings of hair, when they would show a miracle, and never perceived till now.' He proceeds:

'Also the said Rood was set in the market-place, first at Maidstone, and there showed openly to the people the craft of moving the eyes and lips, that all the people there might see the illusion that had been used in the said image by the monks of the said place of many years, time out of mind, whereby they had gotten great riches in deceiving the people, thinking that the said image had so moved by the power of God, which now plainly appeared to the contrary.'

As to the great riches, Mr. Bridgett quotes evidence which shows that the abbey was in debt in 1524; but when he says that there is no proof of any kind that the miracles, for which the Rood was famous, had anything to do with the machinery, he is going too far. He may disbelieve the evidence which he himself quotes, but he must not say that it does not exist. Lambard, the author of a *Perambulation of Kent*, in 1570, who professes to quote published Catholic documents, tells a long story of the construction of an ingenious mechanical rood, able 'to bow down and lift up itself, to shake and stir the hands and feet, to nod the head, to roll the eyes, to wag the chaps, to bend the brows, and finally to represent to the eye both the proper motion of each member of the body, and also a lively, express, and significant show of a well-contented or displeased mind,' &c., and narrates how this came, partly by accident, partly by apparent miracle, into the possession of the monks of Boxley, who 'abused this wooden god after they had thus gotten him,' in a manner which he does not relate in detail 'because a good sort be yet alive that saw the fraud openly detected at Paul's Cross, and others may read it disclosed in books extant and commonly known.'

These appear to be the principal authentic sources of

evidence as to the nature of the Rood of Boxley, though there are many other contemporary letters quoted by Mr. Bridgett, which show that it was universally described by the writers (who are mostly Calvinists) as an imposture and as connected with the working of miracles. The evidence, as it stands by itself, amply justifies the terms in which modern historians have referred to the affair, and it therefore remains to enquire whether there is sufficient counterbalancing evidence, direct or presumptive, to justify Mr. Bridgett in using the strong language which he does against those who have repeated the story of Chambers and Lambard.

Mr. Bridgett has a perfect right to his own opinion on the evidence, and we should not care to attach any very fundamental importance to the establishment of the truth of the traditional story of the Rood of Boxley; but we cannot see that he has in the least *disproved* it, or that he has any right to call those who tell it either liars and forgers or reckless believers of lies and forgeries. His counter-argument appears to run on two inconsistent lines. In reference to the narrative of Chambers he argues that it shows the machinery to have been out of repair, and the monks ignorant of its existence. From Lambard's story he deduces the conclusion that there was no attempt at deception because the machinery and its use were notorious to all the pilgrims who came to worship at Boxley. As regards the first of these arguments it may be pointed out that the machinery was not so out of order but that the figure could be put through its paces in Maidstone market-place and at Paul's Cross; while if the second were true where would be the use of a public exposure in these places of a mechanism which was perfectly notorious to everyone?

We have not the smallest wish to be unfair to Mr. Bridgett in this necessarily brief summary of the opposing positions on this subject; but we cannot see that he has produced anything to refute the statements put about by the contemporary Protestants except his belief as to the probabilities of the case. His suggestion that no deception was intended in the mechanical motions of the figure is worthy of all consideration; but it seems to us clear that it was not regarded as such an innocent device at the time. If its purely mechanical nature was so open and avowed, where is the occasion for all the fuss that was made about it? The Reformers might very reasonably have destroyed the Rood as a somewhat coarse and degrading piece of ecclesiastical furniture, but they would merely have made themselves ridiculous if they had held up

to ex
perf
ever.
of Bo
gerat
have
Bridg
show
a lie.
he pr
were
tion i
super
Relig
of cr
the l
offen
he be
in the

It
argum
judgm
Lamb
Rumv
person
both t
to ap
Elizab
chapla
among
Boxley
would
Queen
repress
St. Ru
must h
ordina
reverer
the sto
prophe

'Jel
madma
he said.
[English
that the
VOL.

to execration as a deceit and a fraud that in which it was perfectly notorious that there had been no deception whatever. It is possible that the extent to which the attractions of Boxley depended on its wonderful Rood has been exaggerated, and that the mechanical capabilities of the figure have also been exaggerated, but we do not think that Mr. Bridgett has contributed anything very material towards showing that the story about it is nothing but a forgery and a lie. The most important pieces of external evidence which he produces, namely, the fact that none of the Boxley monks were punished for imposture, and that Warham, in his visitation in 1511, does not appear to have detected imposture or superstition there, do not seem to prove more than this. Religious imposture was far from being the most heinous of crimes in the moral code of Henry VIII. Denial of the king's supremacy was a much more unpardonable offence in his eyes than the superstitions and deceits which he believed (or at any rate professed to believe) to be common in the then corrupt state of the Roman Church.

It may be added that the minor details of Mr. Bridgett's argument do not increase the reader's confidence in his judgment. In partial disproof of a second statement of Lambard's, that there was another mechanical figure (of St. Rumwald) at Boxley, which tested whether the pilgrim was a person of clean life, and that it was necessary to offer freely both to the confessor and to this figure before being allowed to approach the Rood, he quotes the accounts of Queen Elizabeth of York, which contain the expenses of certain chaplains sent by her to make offerings at various shrines, among which is no mention of more than a single offering at Boxley. It does not seem to occur to him that the monks would hardly venture to suggest to the representative of the Queen that he must prove that he (or rather she whom he represented) was in clean life, by approaching and offering to St. Rumwald. One extraordinary piece of Biblical exegesis must be quoted. In illustration of the proposition that 'the ordinary run of nobles and men-at-arms had little enough reverence for men of peace and of religion,' Mr. Bridgett quotes the story of the anointing of Jehu by one of the sons of the prophets.

'Jehu returns to the captains. They ask him, "Why came this madman to thee?" Jehu replies, "You know the man, and what he said." They answer, "It is false; but rather do thou tell us"' [English Revised Version, 'tell us now']. 'It must be admitted that their calling the prophet a madman, and making up their minds

that his words were false before they knew them, might almost make us think that the speakers were courtiers of Henry or Elizabeth rather than of Jehu'!

The italics are our own, so is the note of exclamation; but the idea that the captains repudiated the words of the prophet first, and asked what they were afterwards, is, so far as we are aware, wholly Mr. Bridgett's.

We are the less disposed to differ from Mr. Bridgett more than is necessary, because in his second principal contention in this volume he appears to be right in the main. This has to do with the authenticity of certain documents used by Strype and quoted from him by various authors of repute. These documents are contained among the papers of Sir James Ware, an antiquarian and historian of high character on Irish subjects, who died in 1666. These papers were bound up into a large number of volumes (Mr. Bridgett assumes that this was done in Sir James's lifetime, but it is not clear whether this is certain), which are now preserved partly in the Bodleian Library and partly in the British Museum. Among the papers, which include a large number of transcripts of historical and antiquarian documents, are some which profess to be copies of memorials written by Cecil, Henry Sidney, and other prominent statesmen of the reign of Elizabeth, and relating to the religious troubles of the time, especially with reference to Ireland. The originals are in some cases said to be in the possession of men of note, such as Archbishop Ussher or Sir Robert Cotton. These documents are used by Robert Ware, son of Sir James Ware, in several works which he published against the Roman Church, notably one called *Foxes and Firebrands*, and as the authorities on which they appeared to be based were so respectable they were quoted freely by Strype, and from him by many later writers. Their contents are not, indeed, of first-rate importance, but they supply details by which to fill out charges against the Roman Church, and it is therefore right that they should be investigated, and natural that the followers of that Church should be glad to discredit them if possible.

One or two specimens may be given of these documents. One of the stories which Robert Ware gives as having been taken from a copy made by his father from a manuscript in the possession of Archbishop Ussher, but which Mr. Bridgett does not appear to have found to exist among the Ware papers, is that of Dr. Cole, who was sent to Ireland with a commission from Mary to bring about a massacre of Protes-

tants
a se
pack
not c
to go
the l
can f
the I
so p
parti
the V
Lord
prof
verte
oaths
is am

Im
impo
there
serio
suspe
forge
fathe
amor
This
believ
later
ral re
and f
tend
which

In
far as
an op
Muse
stater
Ware
the er
Sir Ja
second
Irelan
that t
period
which
centur

tants; but at Chester, where he unwarily mentioned this fact, a servant girl abstracted his commission and substituted a pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost, which was not discovered till he arrived in Dublin. He had, of course, to go back to obtain a fresh commission, and the delay saved the lives of the Irish Protestants. Another tells of a Dominican friar, named Faithful Commin, who claimed credit with the Pope for having passed as a Protestant with the object of so preaching about the ceremonies of the Church as to set parties in England by the ears. This is recorded among the Ware papers, with a note to the effect that it is a copy of Lord Cecil's memorandum preserved by Ussher. A third professes to be the confession of Malachias Malone, a converted friar, who tells many tales of dispensations for false oaths taken in the service of the Roman Church. This, too, is among the Ware papers in the British Museum.

It will be seen that these are not matters of fundamental importance, and, so far as appears from Mr. Bridgett's book, there are not many of them; but they are quite sufficiently serious to deserve examination if there is any ground for suspecting them. Mr. Bridgett's contention is that they are forgeries, some of them inserted by Robert Ware among his father's papers, and others falsely asserted by him to be among them, and that they have no basis in fact whatever. This he supports on evidence both internal and external. He believes the handwriting of the documents themselves to be later than the date of Sir James Ware, and he produces several reasons, both from the intrinsic characters of the narratives and from certain discrepancies as to facts and dates, which tend to show that they cannot be the genuine compositions which they profess to be.

In both branches of evidence he seems to be justified. As far as concerns the handwriting of the papers, we have had an opportunity of examining the volumes in the British Museum to which Mr. Bridgett refers, and can confirm his statement that the suspected papers are not in Sir James Ware's handwriting, and are apparently of a date later than the end of his life. The interval of time between 1666, when Sir James died, and 1686, when his papers were sold to the second Earl of Clarendon while he was lord-lieutenant of Ireland, is so short that it is impossible to affirm dogmatically that these documents must have been written within that period, but they certainly are in that type of handwriting which is associated with the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Mr. Bridgett, however, is not quite full nor quite

accurate in what he says on this point. He does not mention that the papers to which he refers are in at least two quite distinct hands (neither of which has at all the appearance of being a feigned hand); and where (p. 213) he says of a marginal note to one of the documents, dated 1679, that it is in a writing 'quite similar to the entry at the head of the document, which affects to be Sir James's,' and is dated 1657, he is misleading, for, though the writing may be described as 'similar,' it is certainly not the same, and it would be impossible to say, so far as the entry¹ itself is concerned, that it was not written in 1657. This, however, is not of great importance.

It appears then that there is a *prima facie* ground of suspicion connected with these documents, which, occurring among the genuine papers of Sir James Ware, have an air of belonging to a time later than the end of his life. This is not, however, decisive of the question. The papers do not, so far as we have seen, directly claim to have been written by Sir James, and if, as seems not impossible, his remains were not bound up into volumes till after his death, they might still be genuine copies of genuine documents, made by some other person and mixed with Sir James's papers. The question of their authenticity must be settled by the internal evidence, and on this point the arguments of Mr. Bridgett appear to be convincing. He has detected various blunders in details of chronology, of which we may quote one or two instances. The story of Dr. Cole and his pack of cards, referred to above, states that the meeting between that worthy and Lord Sussex, to whom his commission had to be presented, took place in Dublin on October 7, 1558; but Sir James Ware's own *Annals*, which are supported by the *Irish State Papers*, declare that Lord Sussex was absent from Dublin from September 14 to November 18. The narrative of Thomas Heath, a concealed Jesuit, is said by Robert Ware in one of his printed works to be copied from 'the Registry of the Episcopal See of Rochester, in that book which begins Anno 2 and 3 Phil. et Mar., and continued to 15 Eliz. ;' but the Registers of Rochester are extant and contain no such story. An assembly of bishops and clergy is said by Ware (who professes to quote *Lord Cecil's Memorial*, and gives chapter and verse) to have been held on May 15, 1559, at which fourteen Roman Catholic bishops, who are

¹ The entry is to the effect 'Ex. Bib. Cottonens. I got these memoirs' (Mr. Bridgett wrongly reads 'this memoir') 'on the 6th Oct. 1657.' Mr. Bridgett might have strengthened his case by adding that, so far as is to be gathered from the index to the Catalogue, no such memoir exists in the Cotton Library now.

named, 'endeavoured to oppose our gracious Queen in the re-establishment of the Church of England,' and were promptly 'quelled' by her Majesty; this assembly is referred to by both Froude and Lingard, following Strype, who has taken it from Ware, but Mr. Bridgett shows that six at least of the fourteen bishops named cannot have been present at any meeting in London at that date.

We have not space for further illustrations of the application of the chronological test to Ware's narratives; but it may be added that several of them are improbable in themselves, that the phraseology used by persons represented to be Roman Catholics in reference to the Roman Church is unnatural, and that several persons named as Jesuits are stated to be unknown in the records of that Order. Enough has been said to show that any facts which rest on Robert Ware for their authority must be looked upon with the gravest suspicion. Whether a complete and careful examination of the subject would in any way relieve Robert Ware of this suspicion is a question, and whether either his character or the tales which he records are of sufficient importance to merit such an examination is another question; but as the matter stands at present the presumption is with Mr. Bridgett, and his research into the subject is to be commended. We cannot equally commend the tone of his criticism, which, in dealing with matters of historical detail, would be more effective if it were less controversial and declamatory. In one case at least, moreover, he is scarcely fair, when he condemns a late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Dr. Ball, for repeating the story of Dr. Cole on the authority of Ware's reference to the Earl of Cork and the two Archbishops Ussher. A writer cannot have recourse to original documents in respect of every statement which he makes; and if he names the second-hand authority on whom he depends it is as much as can be required of him. The omission to mention Ware, while referring to the authorities named by Ware, which Mr. Bridgett attributes to another writer, Mr. Bagwell, is a much more serious matter and undoubtedly deserves blame.

We have treated the subjects discussed by Mr. Bridgett purely as questions of historical accuracy. The Reformation does not rest on Dr. Cole and his pack of cards, or on the mechanical Rood of Boxley, nor does Mr. Bridgett pretend that it does. The Church of England has no reason to fear or to discourage historical criticism, and can only wish that the truth may be established. Its members have not been always free from blame—far from it; but the same must be

said of every Church on earth, and if it comes to a question of 'pious frauds' possibly the Roman Church might not find its record any better. But we have no wish to raise the controversial question here. The real lessons to be derived from Mr. Bridgett's book concern historians rather than theologians. They are the old familiar ones, 'Don't rely on second-hand authorities,' and 'Verify your references.'¹

ART. V.—BUDDHISM.

Buddhism in its Connexion with Brahmanism and Hinduism and in its Contrast with Christianity. By Sir MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS, K.C.I.E., M.A., Hon. D.C.L. of the University of Oxford, Hon. LL.D. of the University of Göttingen, Hon. Member of the Asiatic Societies of Bengal and Bombay and of the Oriental and Philosophical Societies of America, Boden Professor of Sanskrit, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, &c. (London, 1889.)

THE study of religions not our own has become highly fashionable of late. The old plan was to set down the existence of all other faiths to the machinations of the devil, and leave them aside as wholly unworthy of consideration. The idea that they contained germs of truth, or that anything might be learnt by means of studying them, scarcely entered people's heads. It is possible that this wholesale neglect of all faiths except the Christian came from the extreme Calvinistic view of the world. The heathen were looked upon simply as men predestinated to destruction, lying wholly outside the narrow boundaries of the redeeming purpose of God. This was not, at any rate, the more ancient view. The well-known language of Justin Martyr, and of Athanasius, show how the ancient Church recognized the influence of the Word of God in regions outside the Jewish and Christian dispensations.

¹ It may be remarked that we have in this article consistently disregarded the first of these canons, having been obliged in almost every case to take quotations and references simply from Mr. Bridgett. That this is not absolutely safe may be gathered from an instance or two quoted above, and from at least one false reference which we have found, viz. on p. 249 the British Museum MS. referred to should be Addit. 4791 instead of 4785.

But, at the same time, the scientific study of other religions is a modern growth, and, like many modern growths, it threatens to become over-luxuriant. Bishop Butler remarks in the *Analogy* that 'it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature when, upon a comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater importance than the other to consider this other as of scarce any importance at all.' And the opposite tendency is equally remarkable, when a thing which has been considered of no importance is discovered to have a certain amount of interest to infer at once that it is the one thing worth considering in the world. This tendency has been fully illustrated in the history of the science of religion. Heathen creeds, which were once simply passed by, have met with a sudden change of fortune. The better ones have been exalted to a position quite equal to that of Christianity, and it is more than hinted in certain quarters that the functions of the missionary are at an end. Why need we attempt, it is asked, to disturb the faith of those who hold to so very lofty a faith as that of Buddhism? For, after all, there are so many points of contact between the faith of Christ and that of the Buddha that proselytizing may well be out of the question. Why cannot both creeds go on together, each doing its work, living and letting live?

It would be easy to show that this attitude rests upon a very limited and inadequate view of Christianity. Indeed, it usually accompanies a conviction that Christ's mission was exhausted in the Sermon on the Mount. But it is also possible to show that it springs from a no less mistaken view of Buddhism. In a lecture delivered at Oxford, and then printed in the *Nineteenth Century* for July 1888, the Bishop of Colombo developed this view of the religion of the Light of Asia. The discussion of so large a question in a lecture could not but be somewhat slight, and, though the real nature and affinities of Buddhism as it is in Ceylon were clearly set forth, it was plain that there was room for a much fuller treatment. We believe that we may hope for a more complete treatise at no very distant date from the Bishop's pen.

In the meantime the veteran scholar Sir Monier Monier-Williams has brought his life-long study of Oriental languages and modes of thought to the consideration of this problem. In a series of lectures delivered in Edinburgh he has given us a scientific and scholarly treatment of Buddhism, its relations to other forms of religion in India, and its contrast with Christianity. There is much more in this volume than it is easy to absorb at a first reading. It seems as if there were in

it materials for the study of the antiquities of Buddhism—its religious symbols, architecture, customs, and history—as well as a complete exposition of the faith itself. Such a work cannot but be of first-rate importance for the final settlement of the questions as to the real nature and value of Buddhism. It is, perhaps, too much to hope that its appearance will succeed in destroying altogether the sentimental leanings to Buddhism, of which we hear so much nowadays; but we are quite sure that anyone who wishes to know the facts may find them here, and that they are not of such a nature as to encourage Buddhist sympathies.

One of the points which comes out most clearly from the present work is the close and inseparable union of Buddhism with other forms of Hindu religion. It is commonly maintained that the work of Gautama represented a completely new start: he is described as coming forward with a Gospel of self-sacrifice and love in an age of immorality, with a spiritual and transcendent agnosticism in an age largely given over to idolatry. The facts of his life are difficult to ascertain; later hands have adorned them copiously with miraculous legends; but those which can be acquired show the operation of causes natural in the age and country where Gautama passed his life. At the time of his birth, Sir Monier Williams tells us, Brahmanism had passed through three stages of its existence. There had been the old worship of the personified forces of nature represented in the Vedic hymns, which had developed into the philosophical Brahmanism of the Upanishads on the one hand, and the cumbrous system of caste rules and domestic usages found in the law books. But Brahmanism had not been able to rule things all its own way. Scepticism, bold and blatant, had arisen and said many hard things about the orthodox faith, going so far on occasion as to pronounce the Vedas 'a tissue of nonsense.' Even the philosophical Brahmanism represented earnest doubt clinging as far as might be to the Vedic religion. Buddhism itself was a form of scepticism—not offensive and quarrelsome, nor philosophical, but still a scepticism after all, rising out of a contemplation of things under the aspect they bore to the Brahmanistic philosophy. According to the more trustworthy traditions of Gautama's life, he is said to have been born about 500 B.C. in a family of considerable position. 'The father of the founder of Buddhism was simply a chief of the Śākya tribe—certainly not a king in our sense of the term, but rather a great zamindar, or landlord, whose territory was not so large in area as Yorkshire' (p. 22). The natural course

open
portc
are le
inter
displa
was m
of the
the d
and m
seeks
hand
brace,
Outsi
Thus
his fa
a pas
charac
'as a
their
ing to
and p
course
This
tion.
himse
he m
attain
formu
Brah
hopef
follow
much
ceedin
quite
Kusa
his no
he is c
whate
appea
oppos
strugg
doctri
simply
chain
involv

open to Gautama would have been to be instructed in certain portions of the Veda, and to become a soldier (p. 24). There are legends to the effect that he failed to display the proper interest in martial and athletic exercises, but, on being tested, displayed his superiority 'in archery and the twelve arts.' He was made to marry early and had at least one son. The birth of the son is the 'first momentous crisis of his life.' Already the desire to forsake his home had been working within him, and now he feels that it must be done at once or never. 'He seeks the chamber of his wife, and finds her asleep with her hand on the head of his infant son. He longs for a last embrace, but fearing to arouse her suspicions hurries away. Outside, his favourite horse is waiting to aid his flight' (p. 28). Thus he escapes from home, and, when at a safe distance from his father's territory, cuts off his hair, exchanges clothes with a passing beggar, and 'assumes the outward aspect and character of a wandering ascetic.' He attaches himself first 'as a disciple to two Brahmins . . . who imbue him with their own philosophical tenets and theory of salvation.' Failing to find this satisfactory, or to attain by its means the rest and peace which he sought, he attempts to establish intercourse with the divine beings, by means of self-mortification. This too fails, and so he turns to a third method, viz. meditation. 'Under the shelter of a sacred fig tree . . . he gave himself up to higher and higher forms of meditation. In this he merely conformed to the Hindu Yoga—a method of attaining mystic union with the Deity, which, although not then formulated into a system, was already in vogue among the Brahmins' (p. 32). At first sight this seems almost a less hopeful method than the other two. Sir Monier cites the following regulations for its due performance from a work much later than the time of Buddha, but illustrating his proceedings sufficiently well. 'Holding his body, head, and neck quite immovable, seated on a firm seat in a pure spot with Kuśa grass around, the devotee should look only at the tip of his nose, and meditate on the Supreme Being.' Further on he is directed to meditate so profoundly 'as to think of nothing whatever' (p. 32). This process, though so unsuggestive in appearance, was crowned with success, in spite of much opposition on the part of Mara, the evil spirit. After a long struggle he emerged fully enlightened—a Buddha. The doctrine which had been attained after all this trouble was simply as follows: 'that this present life is only one link in a chain of countless transmigrations; that existence of all kinds involves suffering, and that such suffering can only be got rid

of by self-restraint and the extinction of desires, especially of the desire for continuity of personal existence' (p. 35). It was pessimism of the most unmitigated kind, leading, if properly put into practice, to a paradoxical negation of all human interests and joys, to the abolition of all social ties, with a view to the ultimate extinction of all individual being. Strictly speaking there was no reason for Gautama on discovering this truth to do anything further; and he was subjected, according to the legend, to a new temptation on the part of Mara, in order to persuade him to enjoy his knowledge by himself. However he resists this and goes to the deer park at Benares, where five ascetics, who had been his companions when he sought illumination through self-mortification, were still practising their self-tortures. He converts them, and he and the five constitute the first six members of the monastic fraternity. He spent about forty-five years in itinerant preaching, and died at an advanced age from a fit of indigestion, caused by eating pork.

These are the bare outlines which have survived of the life of Gautama and the simplest facts about his teaching. It is easy to see how widely the renunciation of home and kindred, which forms the starting-point of Gautama's career, differs from anything known to Christianity under that name. The disciples of Christ were to be in the world, although not of it, and to be kept from the evil one. There was no reason for supposing that the Buddha was the first to whom this plan of attaining truth had occurred: the story as told by Sir Monier shows plenty of indications that at the time of his departure rigorous asceticism was a common practice. And the renunciation which he preached has even less community with that demanded of the Christian. It is different alike in motive and in nature. In order to make this clear it will be necessary to speak a little more in detail of the substance of the original doctrine taught by Buddha.

There are two principles which seem to be the foundations of all that Gautama taught. The one is that this is the worst of all possible worlds. Sir Monier tells us (p. 36) that this conviction is not uncommon in India. 'The climate is not conducive to optimistic views of life.' It seems to have been shared by many other thinkers of Buddha's day. 'The Upanishads and systems of philosophy which followed on them all harped on the same string. They all dwelt on the same minor key-note' (p. 101). The other is that there is no final difference in kind between gods and men and animals. 'All life is merely one link in a series of successive existences,

and in
Gautama
all India
the Buddha
formed
Life, he
life after
was the
cancel
was two
and igno
was igno
all life
dulginc
perseve
of this
ence,
describ
us that
flame.
compl
and d
desires
(p. 13)
mean
to be
negati
what
contin
which

'In
breeze,
of the t
neither
thing, a
about i
lazy, bl

Th
or wha
end wh
the cre
only c
This is
lost.
next o

and inseparably bound up with misery' (p. 99). Here again Gautama was not original. 'It would be easy to show how all Indian philosophy was a mere scheme for getting rid of the bugbear of metempsychosis' (*ibid.*). These two root ideas formed the point of departure for all Gautama's teaching. Life, being thus evil, and actions having power to influence life after life in an endless series, the great object of every man was the extinction of all individual existence and the gradual cancelling of the effects of action. The cause of all the misery was twofold—lust, especially in the form of the desire for life, and ignorance. The ignorance which caused all the mischief was ignorance 'of the four truths of Buddhism—ignorance that all life is misery, and that the misery of life is caused by indulging lusts, and will cease by suppressing them' (p. 99), by perseverance in the noble eightfold path (cf. p. 44). The end of this process is, of course, Nirvana—that state of semi-existence, semi-annihilation, which is apparently so difficult to describe. As regards this term 'Nirvana,' Sir Monier tells us that the word means originally 'the state of a blown-out flame.' 'Hence its first meaning is properly restricted to the complete extinction of the three chief fires of lust, ill-will, and delusion, and a total cessation of all evil passions and desires, especially of the desire for individual existence' (p. 139). Hence we may infer that it does not necessarily mean 'the annihilation of all existence.' The difficulty seems to be that, while it is comparatively easy to understand its negative meaning, viz. the extinction of lust, it is hard to see what remains when lust is extended to cover the desire for continuity of existence. Sir Monier gives an illustration, which he hopes will not shock his Indian friends.

'In crossing the Indian Ocean, when unruffled by the slightest breeze, I have sometimes observed a jelly-fish floating on the surface of the transparent water, apparently lifeless. The creature is evidently neither asleep nor awake. It certainly is not thinking about anything, and its consciousness is doubtful. All that can be affirmed about it is that it seems to be drinking in the warm fluid in a state of lazy, blissful repose' (p. 141).

This suggests to Sir Monier the state of Nirvana; and this, or whatever else like it Buddhists mean by the term, is the end which they long for. On all the chief questions of life, the creation, and the origin of evil, Buddhism is silent. 'The only creator recognized by true Buddhists is act-force' (p. 116). This is Karma, often translated destiny. This force is never lost. It determines at the end of one life what will be the next one to be passed through. 'The only eternal things' in

the Buddhist conception 'are the causality of act-force and the succession of cause and effect—the eternity of "becoming," not of "being"' (p. 118). The doctrine of Karma was another of Gautama's inheritances. It appears in Brahmanism also. But this is not the point of immediate importance for us here. Our chief interest lies in its relation to moral theory. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as sin in Buddhism. A wrong action is one which springs from lust, indeed; but it is not this fact which causes its wrongness so much as its tendency to maintain life and so protract misery. 'By an unrighteous act [Buddhism] meant an act producing suffering or demerit of some kind, and it bade every man act righteously, in order to escape suffering and to accumulate merit, and thus work his own perfection—that is to say, his own self-extinction' (p. 124). The only object of life is to lay up such a store of merit by self-denial that the force of previous acts may be cancelled and the life exempted from further transmigrations. This most clearly takes away the highest motive from acts of self-denial: they are, in strictness, what some thinkers have said all unselfish acts are—complicated and subtle forms of selfishness. It should, however, be noticed that, though the highest life is open to all, it is easy only to monks and nuns, but even in their case is not a matter of external obedience to a code: it requires heart belief and heart purity.

We have given, to the best of our power, a brief outline of the Buddhistic system in its original form. Anyone who is so disposed may find in Sir Monier's book ample details, citations from original authorities, and the like—all evidence of the care and certainty with which Sir Monier speaks. The above meagre sketch will, we hope, be sufficient to bear out Sir Monier's contention that Buddhism aims at the suppression of all natural human cravings. It is anti-religious rather than religious, since it throws aside altogether the whole question of the existence of a God; and it thus stifles all human instincts of worship. It is, in its essence, anti-social, since it presents celibate monasticism as the ideal life. And it supplies, by the very necessity of the case, a false and inadequate motive for morality.

That so empty and paradoxical a system should have a firm hold upon the numbers of people who are counted as Buddhists would be indeed a trial to the imagination. The necessity of accepting so difficult an idea is saved us by the fact that the system as described above has not met with so large a number of adherents. It is so flexible in character,

so sli
religio
Buddh
princip
claime
taking
tolerat
same t
even, s
drawn
came i
of The
spirit.
the ris
the A
Bu
human
aimed,
truth
becam
of man
their
as a s
sophic
ence, i
worth
is in th
saint-v
renunc
ranged
his tea
ment s
and th
of dig
mere c
commu
could
the w
Buddh
is to fo
worlds
of thin
Buddh
action
the Bu

so slightly defined, that all the various forms of Indian religion and superstition have found a home within it. Buddhism is not a term implying the acceptance of Buddha's principles to the exclusion of Brahmanism. 'It has never claimed to be an exclusive system. It has never aimed at taking the place of other religions. On the contrary, it tolerates all, and a Buddhist considers that he may be at the same time a Hindu, a Confucianist, a Taoist, a Shintoist, and even, strange to say, a Christian' (p. 552). Sir Monier has drawn out with great care the process by which Buddhism came into contact with and adopted the various prevalent forms of Theism and Polytheism, which were in reality alien to its spirit. We propose to illustrate two of these developments—the rise of Theism through saint-worship and the growth of the Avatar doctrine in Tibet.

Buddha himself had never claimed to be anything but a human being following out a self-chosen mission. This aimed, as we have seen, simply at the proclamation of his truth and the formation of an order of monks. It soon became clear that the truth was too much for the generality of mankind; it was too paradoxically in contravention of all their natural cravings. 'It became imperatively necessary, as a simple preservative measure, to convert a cold philosophical creed, based on an ultra-pessimistic theory of existence, into some sort of belief in the value of human life as worth living' (p. 173). One line of advance in this direction is in the direction of Theism. This seems to have begun by saint-worship—the veneration, first, of Buddha, who by his renunciation had won Nirvana. With him would soon be ranged those who followed in his steps, and attained through his teaching similar glory and dignity. The first development seems to have consisted in the personification of the law and the monastic community, and their elevation to a place of dignity on an equality with Buddha himself. But 'the mere offering of homage, either to a system of law or to a community of living monks, or to departed human saints,' could not long be satisfactory. One further course was open—the worship of future Buddhas. Gautama is one of the Buddhas, or the enlightened ones, of this age only; one more is to follow in this, and others still in the weary succession of worlds which are expected to follow in the Buddhistic view of things. These are in a sense more attractive than extinct Buddhas, for they at least have the potentiality of life and action in them, while both are suppressed and annihilated in the Buddhas of the past. We are not, then, surprised to learn

that Maitreya, the last Buddha of this age, whose advent is still to come, is the object of much devotion and worship. He is indeed the only one of the 'Buddhas designate' who is worshipped by all Buddhist countries. And there is all the difference between the worship of such a being and that of the excellent but extinct Gautama. 'The one is a mechanical act, fraught with beneficial consequences, but not supplying any religious need. On the other hand, actual prayers were addressed to Maitreya, as to a living merciful being, whose favour it was all-important to secure' (p. 182). It is curious to notice that with the growth in number of the Buddhas designate there went a change in the moral aim of Buddhists. According to the 'Great Method,' these numerous beings 'appear to have remained quite contented with their condition, so long as it involved perpetual residence in the heavens, and quite willing to put off all desire for Buddhahood and Pari-Nirvana' (p. 190). So we learn (p. 142) that 'Nirvana and Pari-Nirvana . . . have no place in the aims or thoughts of the ordinary adherents of Buddhism at the present day.' Besides this class of future Buddhas and deified saints the gods of the old Hindu mythology are accepted and placed in some of the many heavens. There is also a very large population of goblins, evil demons, and fiends resident in or near the many hells. These are inherited from Hindu mythology, the advantage of their existence being, apparently, that they provide a career for misdeeming Buddhists after this life is over. Thus

'the Pretas are beings of the nature of ghosts and goblins who have recently inhabited the earth, and are often of gigantic size and terrific appearance, with dried-up limbs, hairy countenances, enormous bellies, ever consumed with hunger and thirst, and yet never able to eat and drink, by reason of their contracted throats. . . . Possibly this form of re-birth was invented to deter the laity from withholding food from the monks' (p. 219).

There is also a large selection of benevolent beings, borrowed, like the malicious ones, from Hindu mythology. This is, apparently, a highly popular form of Buddhism; it was accepted, Sir Monier Williams tells us, to a great extent by all Buddhist communities' (p. 221).

Thus, owing to his large-minded toleration of all other religions, that of the Buddha himself has practically relapsed into Brahmanism, and vanished as a distinct profession from the land of its birth. In the north, *i.e.* in Tibet, there has arisen a cumbrous ecclesiastical organization based upon the doctrine of successive incarnations of the Buddha. Here

again
origin
depend
activit
at the
which
effect.
of me
mecha
of a p
by no
cants
order
others
deaf a
fits we
stages,
Tibet,
the rig
Monie
still th
are su
certain
These
degree
guishe
them,
world.
tinuou
Bodhi
Pauch
the Pe
this ar
appear
the Ye
certain
the lat

'It
vention
enforce
like tha
that it v
the intr
would b
tween h

again there has been the widest possible recoil from the original principles of the Buddhist faith. Enlightenment depended, in the theory of Gautama, simply upon personal activity. He had won it himself, as we have seen, by looking at the tip of his nose under the fig tree. This was a process which required no priestcraft, no hierarchy of mediators to effect. But yet it has happened that in Tibet the storing up of merit towards the enjoyment of a higher life has become a mechanical following out of regulations under the guidance of a priesthood. So, again, the monks were originally bound by no rules of allegiance to any superiors. At first all applicants were admitted without enquiry. 'It was only when the order increased that murderers, robbers, debtors, soldiers and others in the king's service, lepers, cripples, blind, one-eyed, deaf and dumb, and consumptive persons, and all subject to fits were rejected' (p. 76). Then the admission fell into two stages, that of the noviciate and that of full monkhood. In Tibet, however, there is a higher order still of men who have the right to be called Lamas. They correspond, says Sir Monier, in some measure to the European abbots. Higher still than these are the specially select body of Lamas who are supposed to be 're-incarnations or re-embodiments of certain canonized saints, and Bodhi-sattvas, who differ in rank. These are called Avatara Lamas, and of such there are three degrees' (p. 265). The classes of Avatara Lamas are distinguished according to the grade of the being incarnated in them, and thence according to the sway they exercise in this world. The highest of all are those who claim to be 'continuous re-embodiments of either a supreme Buddha or his Bodhi-sattva.' There are two such in Tibet, the Dalai and Pauchen Lamas, who are compared as regards authority to the Pope and an archbishop respectively. The reason for this arrangement, suggested by Sir Monier, is interesting. It appears that there are two sects of Buddhism, the Red and the Yellow: the former being lax and allowing monks, under certain conditions, to break their vows of celibacy, whereas the latter is strict on this point.

'It seems likely, then, that the whole Avatara theory was an invention of some shrewd head Lama, who, perceiving that the strict enforcement of celibacy would prevent any hereditary succession, like that possible in monasteries of the Red School, and foreseeing that it would be necessary to prevent the suicidal divisions to which the intrigues of an election to the headship of monasteries . . . would be likely to give rise, bethought himself of a compromise between hereditary succession and election.'

On the death of the Grand Lama there is the greatest excitement to discover where and in whom the Buddha has been re-incarnated. Various oracles are consulted and a child is selected. It frequently happens that the child is made away with before he reaches years of maturity, so that the real government of things ecclesiastical and civil is scarcely to be ascribed to him. In theory, however, he is the object not only of loyal obedience but of worship. With this doctrine of successive incarnations has grown up an enormously elaborate system of ritual. So far as the common people are concerned they are kept well outside the sacred orders, and made to feel their dependence at every turn. Their own prayers, which they, as well as the monks, use frequently, seem to consist chiefly of the reiterated recitation of the formula 'Om mani padme Hum.' This is called the jewel prayer. Its meaning is 'Om! the Jewel in the Lotus! Hum!' It is touching in its simplicity, and believed to be overwhelming in its efficacy. 'But if you ask northern Buddhists to give you the reason for this belief, very few are able to give an intelligible reply' (p. 373). Sir Monier himself believes that it has a history apart from Buddhism, and that 'the majority of those who repeat it are ignorantly doing homage to the self-generative power supposed to inhere in the universe' (p. 372) (a 'more mystical ejaculation', p. 379, 'Om ah Hum,' conveys a still more subtle significance). Whatever its meaning there is no prayer used by human beings which is used so often as this jewel prayer. Machinery is pressed into the service: 'immense prayer-cylinders, set up like mills . . . are kept in incessant revolution . . . by the blind and unconscious force of wind and water.' Indeed, Sir Monier remarks that 'it is to be hoped that when European inventions find their way across the Himalayas steam power may not be pressed into the service of these gross superstitions.' We have not space to describe more fully the elaborate and complex methods adopted by northern Buddhists to store up merit by means of prayer. But we should commend anyone who wishes to know really to what a pass the recoil from Buddha's anti-sacerdotal and anti-ritualistic enlightenment has brought his followers to the study of Sir Monier's chapters on Lamaistic Buddhism.

But it will be said that the ritualism which has just been described is very unlike the sublime metaphysical mysticism which we have learnt to identify with Buddhism. On this head we learn from Sir Monier that in its early days there was no esoteric doctrine attached to Buddhism. He tells

us, h
Buddh
with
to ob
from
denial
human
made
his fol
resulte
system
The p
tition
breath
tion of
The r
able to
drous
declare
Mahat
'astral
the *Lig*
by a B
The in
out thi
ment
powers
Buddh
modern
true sci

We
Monier
not thi
any he
the cor
in its e
things
elemen
a one-s
seem to
did not
opposed
of easy
tion, wh
the new

us, however, that 'profound abstract thought' was, in Buddha's day, a regular means of obtaining a mystic union with the Divine Essence. He used it himself in order to obtain enlightenment, which, when it came, was so far from uniting him with the Divine Essence that it led to a denial of the existence of such a thing. The claim of super-human faculties as the result of this meditation was never made by Gautama, but has been and is constantly made by his followers. 'The development of these ideas in Buddhism resulted from its connexion with the later Yoga (the Hindu system of meditation), which developed similar ideas' (p. 239). The processes employed are very curious. There is the repetition of mystic syllables, such as 'Om,' the suppression of the breath, the adoption of some cramping posture, the abstraction of thought from all its natural objects, and several others. The result of them is expected to be that a man should be able to fly or to get through a keyhole, and do other wondrous things. The esoteric Buddhists of our own happy land declare that there is a body of Buddhist brothers called Mahatmas in Tibet, who practise feats like this and possess 'astral' bodies. Sir Monier Williams quotes the author of the *Light of Asia* to the effect that this statement is denied by a Buddhist of Ceylon who was consulted on the subject. The investigations of the Society for Psychical Research bear out this denial. On the whole Sir Monier reserves his judgment on the question of miraculous or quasi-miraculous powers, though expressing his conviction 'that mystical Buddhism and Asiatic occultism are no more likely than modern European spiritualism to bear the searching light of true scientific investigation' (p. 252).

We have now considered some few of the facts which Sir Monier has offered us in this most interesting book. We do not think that anyone who holds them to be facts can have any hesitation in accepting Sir Monier's verdict as regards the contrast between Buddhism and Christianity. The one in its early and simple form made no claim to do any of the things which a religion is expected to do. It has in it no element of hope; it exaggerates the despair which arises from a one-sided consideration of the evil in life. And it would seem to have prospered and become popular just because it did not do what most reformations have aimed at doing. It opposed no existing forms of things; it adopted an attitude of easy-going toleration towards them all. And this toleration, which was convenient in preventing a disturbance when the new faith was started, was also the cause of its degrada-

tion and dissolution. As regards the alleged parallels with Christianity, we have thought it unnecessary to say much. The subject is fully treated in Sir Monier's book wherever it is suggested by the facts described. They usually appear in those parts of the Buddhistic speculation which are of later growth. Such a case is that of the Avatara Lamas. It is perfectly clear that there is here only the faintest parallel to the doctrine of the Incarnation as taught by the Christian Church. And the same, we think, will be true of the other cases claimed. The one probable exception which we have noticed in the book is that of the Lamaistic ritual, which certainly seems to bear some resemblance to that of the Roman Church.

What is really far more important for us in England than the question of the reality or unreality of Buddhist parallels with Christianity, is that of the attitude of the Christian missionaries and the missionary societies at home towards this faith. We not unfrequently hear it recommended to the Church to go to work with Buddhism in a docile temper—to learn whatever may be learnt from it—to deal with it more in the tolerant spirit of its founder, and to look for new light upon Christianity from the contact with Oriental thought. Or, again, we are told (and in this Sir Monier seems partly to agree) that the Buddhistic faith is thoroughly in sympathy with the Indian type of thought and turn of mind, and that therefore it is but lost labour to try and force an alien faith upon them. Sir Monier does not draw this inference, for at the end of lecture ix. he encourages the missionary to go on in spite of the slowness of his success. It is worth while saying a few words upon these points. For, at first sight, the premisses seem so obvious from which it is inferred that missionary labour is rather out of place in this particular case. As we look back upon the history of the Church it is impossible to deny that Christianity has taken a different colour according to the type of the minds to which it was presented. The difference, for instance, between the theology of the Greek and Latin Churches is very strongly marked indeed. And though in the West throughout the Middle Age the influence of the Church of Rome was so dominant as almost to obliterate racial differences, yet it is impossible to ignore points of dissimilarity between the various constituent elements of the Western Church. It is only modern Ultramontanism that has endeavoured to crush out individuality from the Churches owning Roman sway. We may fairly expect, then, if our efforts are successful and an Indian Church is founded, expressing, as the other national Churches have done

the
differen
rise to
display
theolog
happen
fundam
that it
possess
in any
promin
and thr
our dea
Ultram
liturgy
method
that a r
instance
vantage
tions, su
study o
impossi
which th
time is
difficult
can be r
any cha
and to v
somehov
ence of
no funda
the sugg
Europe
Oriental
Colombo
encourag
'interest
what is
and degra
of Budd
as it ap
savage ;
forward
type of C
attained

the native mind, that it will present a certain amount of difference from all other Churches. Its theology, should it rise to the production of a theology, may be expected to display national characteristics, as Greek, Roman, and English theologies have displayed them in the past. And this, if it happens rightly, will happen without any variation as to the fundamental truths of Christianity. But there is no doubt that it lies very far off in the future. The Church, though possessing in India a certain number of native workers, cannot in any sense be regarded as a native Church. It is still prominently manned from home, and is still English through and through. May we not admit, then, that there may be in our dealings with the native mind an element of unconscious Ultramontanist? We go there with our 'incomparable liturgy' in our hands and offer, at any rate, as the ideal, a method of worship which suits us. And may it not be true that a more thoughtful sympathy with the native mind—for instance, in the matter of ritual—might be cultivated with advantage? These are, of course, only theoretical considerations, suggested by the sense of absolute separation which the study of Sir Monier's book has produced. It seems almost impossible to express the truths of Christianity to minds in which the idea of perpetual transmigration through endless time is rooted almost as a formal necessity of thought. It is difficult to see how the cold, clear fixity of Christian dogma can be made attractive or real to people who can imagine any change taking place in the weary march of infinite time, and to whom no outline is anything but blurred. And yet, somehow or other, this will have to be done: for the experience of 1,800 years has proved that Christian truth can suffer no fundamental change. We may, indeed, dismiss at once the suggestion that the Faith of Christ has found its limits in Europe and America, and has no mission for the thoughtful Orientals. Sir Monier's book has shown, what the Bishop of Colombo maintained in his single lecture, that so far as we encourage, on high æsthetic or philosophical grounds, so 'interesting' a creed as Buddhism, we are really encouraging what is neither interesting nor beautiful—the most absurd and degrading forms of superstition. For the loftier efforts of Buddhism are not those which are popular: the creed as it appears in its popular form is only debasing and savage; and therefore, even if we do allow ourselves to look forward hopefully to the foundation of a definitely Indian type of Christianity, we cannot admit that this will ever be attained without a radical change of some of the fundamental

tenets of Buddhism. Its pessimism, however picturesquely melancholy, its agnosticism, however sublimely metaphysical, and, we may add, its universal toleration will have to go. Christianity is certainly a religion of love, but it also brings a sword upon the earth. It is bound up with a body of definite truth : and it is at war with that which contravenes this truth. Whatever we may have to learn from the presentation of old truths to a new type of mind, we can never accept points of view in flat contradiction with the fundamental presuppositions of Christ's Life and Work. It is to admissions of this sort to which the European adherents of Buddhism seem to invite us. But perhaps it may be answered, 'De te fabula.' Look at home ; are there no superstitions, no debasing savagery there ? Would it not be better, then, not to come before an ancient people, which is quite satisfied with itself and its religion, in the guise of the universal reformer, saying, 'We have the true religion ; listen to us and all will be well' ? Might we not make a little more certain that we have done our best at home before we offer ourselves as examples to others ? That can, no doubt, always be said ; and there is always this amount of truth in it, that we have not reached the ideal state of things as yet at home. But the truth of the retort ends at that point. For the Church of Christ is like a living organism : it derives sustenance from more than one source : and work among the heathen is as absolutely necessary to its well-being as the internal work at home. At no period, except in one of stagnation, can it rest content with one sort or one area of work. The charity which begins at home, it has been remarked, not unfrequently stays there. And so, while we may admit the presence of much that is retrograde and unworthy of the Christian ideal in our age and amongst ourselves, yet that is no reason for holding back from the perpetual mission of the Church to spread the Gospel. And it is mere paradox of self-depreciation to maintain that what we have to offer is not an improvement upon the state of things already existing in India. Even if it were true that every Buddhist was an esoteric Buddhist, holding deep philosophical opinions, practising an altruistic morality, worn with self-control and meditation, with the possibility of flying through the air or slipping through a keyhole almost within his grasp, we think it would still be true that there are things in the Faith of Christ which it would be well for him to learn. But we have seen that the concrete Buddhist is a different creature to this ; so that this remnant of excuse for deprecating missionary enterprise is gone.

If a
we can
Monier
the tru
never a

1. *Bibl*
ma
ed
2. *Bibl*
Ita
(R)
3. *Evan*
Bl
4. *Essa*
3 v
5. *Vulg*
W
6. *S. T*
3 v
7. *The*
and
(Ca)
8. *Old*
to
by
acco
MS
WO
The
H.
9. *Novu*
secu
JOH
sum
secu

THE his
a blank

If anyone has felt troubled at this feeling being in the air, we can recommend no course so profitable as a perusal of Sir Monier's book ; for, so far as we can judge, it puts before us the truth about Buddhism, and of the truth the Church has never any reason to be afraid.

ART. VI.—THE LATIN VERSIONS OF
THE GOSPELS.

1. *Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti V. Pontificis maximi iussu recognita et Clementis VIII. auctoritate edita.* (Rome, 1592.)
2. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ Versiones Antiquæ seu Vetus Italica.* Opera et studio D. PETRI SABATIER. 3 vols. (Rheims, 1743-49.)
3. *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinæ Versionis Antiquæ.* BIANCHINI. (Rome, 1749.)
4. *Essays on Various Subjects.* By CARDINAL WISEMAN. 3 vols. (London, 1853.)
5. *Vulgate* (in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*). By B. F. WESTCOTT. (London, 1863.)
6. *S. Thasci Cæcili Cypriani opera omnia.* G. HARTEL. 3 vols. (Vienna, 1871.)
7. *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* WESTCOTT and HORT. Vol. ii. Introduction [by Dr. HORT]. (Cambridge, 1881.)
8. *Old Latin Biblical Texts : No. I. The Gospel according to St. Matthew, from the St. Germain MS. g₁.* Edited by JOHN WORDSWORTH. *No. II. Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, from the Bobbio MS. k, together with other fragments.* Edited by JOHN WORDSWORTH, W. SANDAY, and H. J. WHITE. *No. III. The Four Gospels from the Munich MS. q.* Edited by H. J. WHITE. (Oxford, 1883-88.)
9. *Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Latine secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi.* Recensuit JOHANNES WORDSWORTH, in operis societatem adsumpto H. J. WHITE. Pars I., Fasciculus i. *Evangelium secundum Mattheum.* (Oxford, 1889.)

THE history of the scientific criticism of the Latin Bible is a blank throughout the Middle Ages. Till the fall of Cor

stantinople made the Greek Testament familiar to the West, the comparative study of the Latin was impossible. Even in the first flush of the Renaissance it was natural that Biblical criticism should expend itself by preference on the at once less known and more important original text. Yet as early as 1514 Cardinal Ximenes in his Complutensian Polyglott revised the Vulgate from ancient manuscripts in Spain, and the edition of Robert Stephens in 1538 is still 'the only complete Latin Bible with anything like a detailed *apparatus criticus*,' for it embodied variants from the Annotations of Erasmus and from twelve French manuscripts of Paris and the neighbourhood. While Ximenes and Stephens worked for scholars, the same task of purifying Jerome's version from late accretions was taken up officially by the Roman hierarchy in the interests of the Church at large. The Council of Trent recommended, and the Popes carried through, an authorized edition, which first appeared in 1590, during the pontificate of Sixtus the Fifth. But Sixtus had constituted himself sole arbiter of the readings to be ultimately accepted, and the results were so disastrous that on his death a fresh revision was at once commenced, in which the suggestions of the Sixtine correctors, Cardinal Carafa and his coadjutors, rejected by Sixtus, were to a large extent restored. The second book was published in 1592 under Clement the Eighth, and the Clementine is still the standard Bible of the Roman obedience.¹

There can be no question that the re-edited text marked critically an important step forward, but the very measure of advance thus attained was itself a bar to further progress. For practical purposes sufficiency and security had been obtained; and if the anathemas with which Sixtus had commended his version as final to universal acceptance disappear from the later edition, yet even Clement's Preface concludes by prohibiting the insertion of any various readings on the margin of the text. A century elapsed before the great scholars of France took up the abandoned task. R. Simon in his *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, A.D. 1690, cf. pp. 23-159) was the first to discuss scientifically on the evidence then at hand the question of the Latin versions as a whole. Martianay, and after him Vallarsi, in the Benedictine edition of St. Jerome's works issued what

¹ The Codex Amiatinus and two codices from Spain, Legionensis (Leon, cent. x.) and Toletanus (Toledo, cent. x.) were employed for the Papal Vulgate; but the collation of the latter arrived apparently too late to be of use (Wordsworth, *Preface to Vulgate*, pp. xi, xiii, xxviii).

was p
time
the G
laid o
convic
every
this v
a large
at Tri
also r
while
Oxford
thorou
The co
Trinity
in his
which
Me
restora
only un
to com
difficul
within
the th
unoccu
Martian
Gospel
manusc
Italia,
part of
Testam
Rheims
years m
the who
whole s
quate v
version
for unh

¹ Of
the great
from Par
Lichfield.
² St.
St. Germ
has not a
usual now

was practically a revised edition of the Vulgate. At the same time the prince of English scholars was preparing an edition of the Greek New Testament, in which equal stress was to be laid on the Latin and on the Greek manuscripts, for it was the conviction of the editor that the true Hieronymian would in every instance be found to be the true Greek reading. With this view Bentley himself, of whom we are speaking, collated a large number of English manuscripts. Walker, his colleague at Trinity, was employed on a similar mission at Paris, and also received readings of Tours MSS. through Sabatier; while yet another scholar contributed collations from Oxford.¹ Unfortunately this splendid undertaking, thus thoroughly equipped, never got beyond the incipient stage. The collections are, however, still preserved in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge; and Bishop Wordsworth gives in his Preface (pp. xvi-xxvi) a conspectus of the readings which were to have been adopted in the Gospels.

Meanwhile on the Continent another vast scheme, the restoration of the ante-Hieronymian or Italic version, was not only undertaken, but carried, albeit not in its author's lifetime, to completion. It was again St. Maur which led the way. The difficulties of a thorough and candid treatment of the Vulgate within the limits of the Roman Church may have inclined the thoughts of the Benedictines towards the then quite unoccupied ground of the Latin texts anterior to Jerome. Martianay had led the way in 1695 with his edition of the Gospel of St. Matthew and Epistle of St. James from Old Latin manuscripts.² In 1716 Sabatier commenced to edit the *Vetus Italica*, and before his death in 1742 the first and the greater part of the second volume—which was to complete the Old Testament—were in print. Together they were published at Rheims the next year; while the New Testament needed six years more spent on it by Delarue before it too appeared, and the whole work was reissued at Paris in 1751. Bentley, whose whole scheme depended on the existence of one single adequate version, the Vulgate, declared the idea of an earlier Italic version to be '*somnium merum*,' and with that curious fatality for unhappy emendation which at times possessed him trans-

¹ Of these MSS. ten are being used by Bishop Wordsworth in the great edition of which we shall presently have to speak—two each from Paris, Oxford, and London; one each from Cambridge, Durham, Lichfield, and Tours.

² St. Matthew from the Corbie MS. *f*₁, with the readings of the St. Germain MS. *g*₁ in the margin. Unfortunately the same notation has not always prevailed for Old Latin MSS., but that which we adopt is usual now, and is employed in both Scrivener and Hort.

formed St. Augustine's well-known dictum, '*Itala* cæteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ' into '*Illa . . . quæ*.' But Sabatier was right, and his life was not wasted. His is in truth one of the most stupendous works to which even a French Benedictine ever devoted himself. In the Book of Genesis we have counted quotations from Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Arnobius, Augustine, Cyprian, Firmicus, Fulgentius, Hilary, Irenæus, Jerome, Junilius, Lucifer, Novatian, Tertullian, Tichonius, Vigilius Tapsensis, besides anonymous works; and all such quotations are enriched with copious notes. For the Gospels the text is taken from the Colbert MS. (c), but the notes record the variants of the two Corbie and two St. Germain, the Claramontane, Cambridge (*f*₁, *f*₂, *g*₁, *g*₂, *h*, *d*) and other MSS.

The same decade saw the publication of a book only second in importance to Sabatier's. Following the lines of Martianay's edition of the Corbie St. Matthew, Bianchini's *Evangeliarium Quadruplex* prints in parallel columns the text of the four Gospels from the Codices Vercellensis (*a*) and Veronensis (*b*), while at the bottom of the page appears also in full Brixianus (*f*) (and for St. Matthew Corbeiensis reprinted from Martianay), besides variants from other manuscripts. Bianchini has been reprinted by Migne¹ under the convenient fiction that a MS. of the Gospels traditionally said to be from the hand of Eusebius of Vercelli may be classed among that Father's works; and this remains still our only source for the text of the three codices *a*, *b*, *f*, the primary authorities, as we shall see, for two of the three classes of ante-Hieronymian versions.

Another century may be passed over before any material contribution is made to the history or to the texts of the Latin versions. But a word must be said of the papers which Cardinal Wiseman² contributed to the defence of the interpolated text of the Three Witnesses in 1 John v. 7. Against St. Augustine's silence on the disputed passage, he urged that St. Augustine, on his own showing, used the '*Itala*' (which Wiseman admitted did not contain it), and that the '*Itala*' was not the only ante-Hieronymian version; all other African Fathers use a distinct text, for convenience denominated African, which can be traced back much farther than the other forms, and was in fact the parent of all of them; and as other African Fathers do bear witness to the passage, their evidence is the evidence of the original and primitive version of the Western Church. Wiseman did

¹ *Patrologia Latina*, vol. xii.

² *Essays*, vol. i. pp. 1-70.

not, of course, prove his immediate point; but he was, so far as we know, the first writer to call attention to, and to some extent to account for, the diversity of Latin texts before St. Jerome. On Sabatier's title-page 'Italian' and 'Old Latin' are convertible terms; Wiseman showed conclusively that Augustine's version, while its agreement with contemporary Italian writers justified him in calling it Italian, was not that of the African Fathers. Whether he was right or wrong in his further proof that the 'African' was not only the earliest Latin version, but the original of all others, is still a moot point; but his argument from comparison with the lexical peculiarities of African authors in general that the language of the 'Old Vulgate' (that is the Old Latin in all its branches) was essentially African, is an element in the question not to be neglected.

Coming nearer to our own times, Vercellone's publication, commenced in 1860, of the newly recovered collections of the Sixtine correctors, under the title *Variae Lectiones Vulg. Lat. Bibliorum*, is important for the history and genesis of the authorized Vulgate text; while, in another direction, a convenient summary of the hitherto attained results on the whole group of questions concerned with Latin versions was laid before English readers in Bishop Westcott's article 'Vulgate' in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.¹ Marked as it is by Dr. Westcott's accustomed fullness and accuracy, nothing illustrates more vividly the progress of knowledge in our own generation than to compare it with the half-dozen pages in which, less than twenty years later, Dr. Westcott's colleague described the characteristics of Latin versions and Fathers in the Introduction to the great Cambridge New Testament.² Every word which Dr. Hort has there written is a lesson; nowhere is his grasp of all the essential elements of a problem more visible. In default of reprinting the whole section (we will not deprive our readers of the pleasure and profit of a recourse to the original work), we can only call attention to the point which is there for the first time enforced. While Sabatier against Bentley urges the separate existence of the Italic version; while Wiseman improves on Sabatier by showing the distinction between the Italian and earlier African text; Hort further demonstrates that even Wiseman's African version falls into two groups, the African properly so called and the European, or text current in Europe, and

¹ Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. pp. 1688-1718.

² *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, vol. ii. Introduction, pp. 78-84.

especially North Italy, before the strictly Italian text came in. And he adds a caution, the need for which will be abundantly illustrated by the examples we shall quote on a later page, that 'there is a wider difference between the earlier and the later stages of the "Old Latin" (in the comprehensive sense of the term) than between the later stages and the Vulgate.'

From Cambridge we turn to Oxford; from Professors Westcott and Hort to Professors Wordsworth and Sanday. In the three volumes of the series of *Old Latin Biblical Texts* which have already appeared at the Clarendon Press, we possess not only texts (carefully revised with the originals) of the composite MS. *g*, the 'African' *k*, and the 'Italian' *q*, but elaborate prolegomena by Bishop Wordsworth, Professor Sanday and Mr. White respectively, which, in their detailed discussion of the individual authorities, develop and occasionally modify, as we shall see, the conclusions which Dr. Hort had formulated in his rapid survey of the problem as a whole. But Bishop Wordsworth's main employment for the last ten years has been the preparation for the Vulgate edition, of which, with the help of Mr. White, he has now published the first fasciculus containing the Gospel of St. Matthew, together with some prefatory matter, devoted to Bentley's intended edition and the like, but without any introductions, these being reserved for the still distant conclusion of the work. If there are many other departments of sacred learning in which Englishmen and English Churchmen must confess to their shame that the best work is done on the Continent, in this sphere of textual criticism and its apparatus we can point with satisfaction and without fear of comparison to the work done and doing under the auspices of the English Universities.

But it is time to pass from this prefatory sketch of the lines on which the activity of scholars has been working since the Renaissance, to the reconstruction, by the help of their labours, of a connected history of the Latin versions themselves.

For the vernacular Christianity of the West our first fixed point is the Church of Africa. It has become one of the commonplaces of ecclesiastical history that the early Church of Rome was Greek-speaking; and though the same thing was probably truer than has generally been thought of the African Church, it scarcely admits of doubt that at the epoch of Tertullian's writings, the opening of the third century, the

Ch
sch
La
in
ear
int
wo
ma
ent
hop
Ne
a v
set
edi
vol
the
to
(fo
mo
tha

son
tur
Fa
Cy
exi
tre
fro
con
anc
Ha
Cy
wit
edi
of
the
sat

sch
For
add
of s
Par
An

Christians of Carthage were substantially Latin, and, as scholars have been accustomed to add, already possessed a Latin Bible. Even Dr. Zahn, who places the African version in the interval between Tertullian and Cyprian, admits the earlier existence of a 'type' or 'stereotyped form' of oral interpretation of the Greek Bible into Latin for the use of the worship of the Church ;¹ and this does not for our purposes materially differ from a 'version.' But in any case the disentanglement of the evidence of Tertullian is, though not a hopeless, still not yet an accomplished task. Rönsch's *Das Neue Testament Tertullians* is on the right lines, but it is not a wholly satisfactory book;² and indeed the text requires settling before the quotations are collected. The Vienna edition, of which we gladly welcome the issue of the first volume,³ will improve our position ; but with the exception of the *Apology*—and the *Apology* contains no Biblical quotations to speak of—the textual authority for Tertullian is so slight (for some treatises there is no extant MS. now known), and moreover his methods of quotation are so loose and so variable, that too much must not be expected from his evidence.

But if Tertullian sometimes quoted from memory and sometimes from the Greek, and often rather alluded to Scripture than quoted it at all, the testimony of a second African Father goes far to supply the gap. In the next generation Cyprian drew his Biblical material incontestably from one existing version, and devoted nearly the whole of his longest treatise to amassing a series of ample and detailed quotations from the canonical writings. The *Testimonia ad Quirinum* contains nearly four hundred passages from the Old Testament and Apocrypha, and almost as large a number from the New. Happily, too, the manuscript material is for the writings of Cyprian comparatively ample, and has been for the first time with any approach to fullness incorporated in Hartel's Vienna edition (1871), one of the books we have named at the head of this article. For the minor treatises and epistles, or rather the quotations contained in them, this edition has a fairly satisfactory text ; but in the *Testimonia* the divergent tradi-

¹ Zahn, *Gesch. d. NTlichen Kanons*, p. 54, 'ein Typus der Dolmetschung,' 'einer durch die lange Uebung mehr oder weniger stereotypirten Form der mündlichen Dolmetschung.'

² The perusal of a single treatise, the *De Præscriptione*, provided the addition of between thirty and forty new references, and the correction of some of the printed ones.

³ *Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. Reifferscheid et Wissowa. Pars i. 1890. It contains the *De Spect.*, *De Idol.*, *Ad Nationes*, *De Test. Anima*, *Scorpiace*, *De Orat.*, *De Bapt.*, *De Pudic.*, *De Ieiunio*, *De Anima*.

tions of different MSS., corrupted from the Biblical version with which each scribe was familiar, have played havoc with St. Cyprian, and Hartel's own text is founded on one unique and eccentric MS. A.¹ But the *apparatus criticus* records the readings of four other MSS., and scholars following the lead of Professor Sanday² have agreed in seeing the truest representative of the original in a ninth century Lorsch MS. now at Vienna, quoted by Hartel as L.³ But although a new text of the *Testimonia* is imperatively required to supersede Hartel's, this must not blind us to the supreme merits of the Vienna editor. His is the first serious edition since Baluze, and the only one at all which can be called in the modern sense critical.

But the evidence of Cyprian for the African version does not stand alone. The MS. *k*, which Dr. Westcott in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 1694 (where it is lettered *f*), called 'a remarkable revision of the African,' is now admitted to be not only African, but the standard for the African text. It is a MS. of the sixth century, containing at present, roughly speaking, the last half of St. Mark and first half of St. Matthew, which once belonged to the great monastery of St. Columban at Bobbio in the Apennines, and in the dispersion of treasures thence found its way to Turin. In the second volume of the Old Latin series Dr. Sanday shows in detail, by comparing it with the text of Cyprian for the Sermon on the Mount, how close the resemblance is, and how great the common difference from all other families of Latin texts.⁴ Out of 140 readings where Latin authorities vary, Cyprian and *k* stand together in over a hundred; and in seventy-five they are agreed against the

¹ We must caution our readers too against accepting Hartel's indices as final. In the list of New Testament passages (vol. iii. pp. 334 *sq.*) we have been able to make considerably over a hundred corrections, what with misprints and the omission to record quotations contained in the treatise *De Dominica Oratione*.

² In *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. ii. pp. xlv-lxiv.

³ If the tests be taken of agreement of A and L respectively, (1) with Cyprian himself in other treatises; (2) with Firmicus Maternus, many of whose quotations in his *De Errore Profanarum Religionum* are taken straight from the *Testimonia*; (3) with the Biblical MS. *k*; it will be found that under (1) L agrees 96 times, A only 59 times, in 132 cases of variation in New Testament passages; under (2) the agreements of L to its disagreements are nearly as two to one, in A as one to two; under (3) out of about 43 readings, the agreements of L are 38, of A only 12.

⁴ Dr. Sanday understates his case by including as divergences (p. xlvii) readings from a letter addressed not by, but to Cyprian, *Ep.* 31. On the other hand he omits the following Cyprianic passages: p. xlvii, Matt. v. 7 add *Test.* iii. 1; Matt. v. 9 add *De Eccl. Unit.* 24; p. l, Matt. v. 37 add *Test.* iii. 12; p. lvi, Matt. vi. 31-33 add *De Dom. Or.* 21; p. lvii, Matt. vi. 34 add *De Dom. Or.* 19.

leading representatives of the European family, *a* and *b*. In the residuum where the African Father and African MS. differ from one another, it would be hard to say offhand whether the palm should be given to the sixth century Biblical MS. or to the third century Father whose text depends on ninth century authority. Internal evidence ranges now on one side, now on the other; but probably one would be justified in saying, that *k* holds an intermediate position between the best and the worst preserved portions of St. Cyprian's writings.

The characteristics of the African version as illustrated from *k* are put together by Dr. Sanday (pp. c-cxxvii) under the two heads of style, grammar and construction, and of vocabulary.

'The use of two co-ordinate verbs for participle and finite verb, of "cum" with subjunctive (in particular the phrase "cum serum factum esset"), of "fui" for "eram," of words like "adoratio," "adoro," "claritas," "clarifico," of the compounds of "eo" (especially "introeo" for "intro"), of "excludo" and "expello" for "eicio" (in the phrase "excludere" or "expellere dæmonia"), of "nequam" for "malus," of "similitudo" for "parabola," all rest on a very broad basis, and a number of others in somewhat less degree.'

From Cyprian may be added 'felix' for 'beatus' (*μακάριος*) and 'bonus' instead of 'suavis' (*χρηστός*); and this latter instance suggests to us one criticism of Dr. Sanday's vocabulary, the misleading omission of all reference to the Greek. It is not true, for example, that 'nequam' is even as frequent in Cyprian as 'malus'; it is true, and this is what Dr. Sanday meant, that 'nequam' replaces 'malus' as the African equivalent (not of *κακός*, which = 'malus,' but) of *πονηρός*. Similarly, it would be untrue to say that Cyprian always uses 'sermo' and never 'verbum'; it would be true to say that he uses them to translate different words, 'sermo,' *λόγος*, and 'verbum,' *ῥήμα*. To nearly all such inductions sporadic exceptions may be found; and it is a problem for discussion how far, in the first place, even our best MSS. give us the whole of Cyprian's Africanisms; for if it is plain that every known MS. except L has suffered depravation from alien Biblical texts, it is scarcely to be expected that that single MS., even though always right when it disagrees with the other MSS., should be always right when it agrees with them; and how far, in the second place, even if we possess an unadulterated Cyprian, we can be sure that he represented an unaltered tradition. For there are phenomena which seem to throw us back to a stage more primitive still. Although Dr. Sanday, perhaps, lays too much stress on the principle that the very earliest translators

must have had a fixed equivalent for every Greek word, we follow him so far as to think that the sporadic occurrence in later African authorities of variants in the rendering of *common* words may often be interpreted as survivals of a once systematic use already tending, in the course of the third century, to disappear. It is here that the evidence of Tertullian, elsewhere vague enough, is decisive. If Cyprian's text once gives us *discens* instead of *discipulus* (μαθητής) or occasionally *natio* for *gens* (ἔθνος), or sporadically *delictum*, *delinquere*, not *peccatum*, *peccare* (ἁμαρτάνειν, ἁμαρτία), *tinguo* not *baptizo* (βαπτίζω), then, since in Tertullian the occasional or exceptional equivalent is seen to be regular or general, the conclusion is justified, not that Cyprian revised his text *currente calamo*—distinct quotations of the same text are too homogeneous for that—but that behind the substantially common text of *k* and Cyprian lies a history and a revision. It is of interest, too, to note that one at least of Cyprian's suffragans at the great Rebaptism Council, Nemesianus of Thubunæ, used a text totally unlike his primate's.

But besides the African Churches, those of Italy were, at least by the time of the conversion of Constantine, entirely Latin speaking, and in need, therefore, of a Latin version; and for this version—never perhaps so homogeneous as the African text—we have far fuller material in Gospel MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries. The two leading MSS. *a* (fourth century, belonging to the Chapter of Vercelli) and *b* (fourth or fifth, in the Chapter Library at Verona), both fairly complete throughout the Gospels, were printed, as we saw, by Bianchini; and though their text is not identical, *a* leaning rather more to the Africans, while *b* is the representative European, their mutual differences are slight compared to their common difference from the Africans. It is certain, in fact, that the Italian and other European Churches from the fourth century onwards used their own Bible; and if Zeno of Verona among Fathers, *k* among MSS. seem to be exceptions to this rule, Zeno was an African,¹ and that *k* found a home at Bobbio two centuries after it was written proves nothing as to its origin. But was this second Bible entirely independent of the first, or may, it have been a local and national modifica-

¹ Such at least is the present local tradition of the Church at Verona; the sacristan at San Zenone points to the dark complexion of the face of the saint's statue in proof. But an Italian Life by Peretti (1597 A.D.) claims St. Zeno as a native of Verona; and the Ballerini in the Life prefixed to their edition of his works, though they decide for his African origin on other grounds, say nothing of local tradition.

¹ C
² In
and ba
clarific
inrepor
cases o

tion of one ultimately identical text? To this question opposite answers have been given, and perhaps, until further enquiry has cleared the ground, no answer ought to be attempted. Dr. Hort suspends judgment; Dr. Sanday, who had at first spoken 'with some confidence of the fundamental separation between the two great families of text, the European and the African,' now 'withdraws all that was said on that point.'¹ And it is certainly true that, in the order of investigation, it is differences which strike one first, just as it has been said that history is the search for distinctions. But then, as deeper study restores proper proportions, resemblances no less important recover their due weight; and without prejudging the solution of so thorny a problem, the similarities which come to light in the passages which will be quoted further on, seem difficult to account for simply by subsequent mixture.

This version, or revision of a version, is now usually called 'European,' to distinguish it from yet another form of fourth century text, which did result incontestably from a revision of existing material in respect both of its underlying Greek readings, and of its imperfect Latinity. It is something of this sort which St. Augustine used, under the title 'Itala,' as a more satisfactory text than the 'codices Afri.' Among MSS. it is represented in Dr. Hort's classification by *f* and *g*, each of which is finding a place in the work of the Oxford editors. The third volume of the Old Latin series reprints and discusses the seventh century Munich MS. *g* of the four Gospels, and the point which seems to be brought out by Mr. White's close examination of it is that 'if it be Italian in its readings, it is European in its renderings;' in other words, that though the text has no doubt been altered into conformity with Greek MSS., the process of change did not in this case extend to the Latinity. The editor selects two words of the most frequent occurrence in the Gospels, *δοξάζω* and *ἐπιτιμᾶω*, and prints side by side the equivalents in seven representative Latin authorities, with the result of showing a very marked agreement between *g* and the most typical European MS. *b*;² and the presumption thus drawn is verified by a careful analysis of some part of each of the four Gospels. Like Dr. Sanday's work on *k*, Mr. White's investigations here are a model of

¹ *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. cclv.

² In the first case the two vary together from *magnifico* to *honorifico* and back again, until we get to St. John, where *b* deserts to the African *clarifico*; in the second they change similarly from *impero* to *præcipio* and *increpo* and *prohibeo* and *comminor*, only rendering divergently in six cases out of twenty-six.

conscientious labour, and labour which is not devoid of immediate result in modifying the conclusions to which even so acute an observer as Dr. Hort could be led by *prima facie* evidence. Mr. White well remarks that a MS. must be considered in minute points, and not merely in 'fallacious test passages,' 'fallacious because they would be the first to be altered by a reviser who might leave the rest untouched.'

The second MS. of the Italian revision, the Brescian codex *f*, shows the continual process of correction extended from readings to renderings, from text to Latinity. It marks the point which Latin versions had reached at the time St. Jerome took them up, and it was an especially happy thought of Bishop Wordsworth to print it below his Vulgate text, so that the student may grasp in a moment the amount of departure from existing MSS. which Jerome introduced; and it is probable that most people will be surprised at the comparative slightness of the variations, especially when we remember that not even such differences as there are between the two can all be due to St. Jerome, unless we are to suppose that *f* represents in every detail the text which he took to remodel.¹ But we cannot help expressing a regret that the Bishop, himself so painstaking a collator—he has inspected with the help of Mr. White and Mr. Youngman no less than eighteen MSS., as well as obtaining at other hands collations of several more—should (apparently) have contented himself in this case with a mere reproduction of Bianchini.

A more difficult question of relationship with the Vulgate arises in the case of *g*₁, the St. Germain MS. used by Stephens, Martianay, Walker, and Sabatier, and now recollated and reprinted as the first of the Old Latin series. For the three other Gospels its text is Hieronymic, and is to be employed as such in the Oxford Vulgate; the St. Matthew is certainly different, and if originally Hieronymic must have been subjected to thoroughgoing 'mixture.' Dr. Hort, it would seem, does regard it as a type of the class of Vulgate MSS., corrupted from pre-existing versions; but the result of Wordsworth's examination of its readings in St. Matthew v. shows that out of seventy-five variations of text only three are agree-

¹ After all, his Preface to the Gospels distinctly lays it down that his rule was to confine his revision to the readings, and leave the renderings, where the sense is not affected, alone; after speaking of his collations of Greek codices for the Gospels, he continues, 'quæ ne multum a lectionis Latinæ consuetudine discrepant, ita calamo temperavimus, ut his tantum quæ sensum videbantur mutare correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant' (Wordsworth, p. 3).

ments with the Vulgate alone,¹ while twenty-seven are of a distinctly European type. Here too, then, if the fundamental stratum was not a Vulgate one, we have to add another to the numerous varieties of Biblical, and especially of Gospel, texts which date back to the fourth century, with its keen intellectual interest in theology and its increased facilities for the rapid multiplication and diffusion of copies. It was this chaos which St. Jerome set himself to reduce to order by the elaboration of a standard Bible for the West, which should be essentially based on Greek manuscript authority, and yet based also on the best of existing Latin translations.

But the publication of the Vulgate was far from bringing the textual history of the Latin Bible to a close. The older versions died hard, and they left their marks on their destroyer. The story is well known how the attempt of an African bishop to substitute Jerome's *cucurbita* for the vernacular *hedera* as the 'gourd' of Jonah, failed before the militant conservatism of his flock, and a similar tendency was always silently at work in the scriptoria. Hence the rapid deterioration of Jerome's text, and hence the need for official revisions such as those of Alcuin and Theodulf in Carolingian times, the predecessors of the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the counter-Reformation. It consequently by no means follows that a manuscript even earlier than Charlemagne can presume to be anything like an adequate representative of Jerome, and the task which Bishop Wordsworth has set before himself becomes one of no little difficulty.

The material, indeed, is abundant enough. The Bishop's apparatus includes twenty-nine MSS., of which sixteen contain the whole, and eight more parts, of St. Matthew, all with one or two exceptions belonging to the ninth or preceding centuries. Five MSS., the Books of Armagh and Kells (from Dublin), the Gospels of Durham, of MacRegol (from the Bodleian), and of St. Chad (from Lichfield), form one British family corrected from Greek MSS. Two, from La Cava in Italy and from Toledo, give the Spanish text. Two represent the recension of Alcuin, two more that of Theodulf. Beyond this outline it is tantalizing to find that Bishop Wordsworth abstains intentionally from speaking of the relations and groups of MSS. The Prolegomena are deferred until the whole text shall have been completed, when, as he expresses the hope, the editors will have gained clearer views, and scholars in general will have had time and opportunity to for-

¹ But even of these, one, *salutaveritis* for *salutatis*, Matt. v. 47, is also an agreement with the African text of St. Cyprian.

multate hypotheses which may throw light on points now obscure. Certainly this method of procedure is the most patient and the most scientific, and the Bishop ought to be congratulated on his resolute avoidance of premature theorizing. But its meaning must be fairly looked in the face. It means that this great and admirable monument of English scholarship foregoes all claim to be itself, and adopts the humbler task of collecting materials for, a final edition. It means that MSS. must be balanced and readings adopted tentatively, with the prospect that new groupings and genealogies may upset first conclusions. It means, too, that the unpractised (and even the practised) student is discouraged to find on every page critical notes such as this, which we quote from St. Matthew vi. 2 (p. 59), '*facies...cum A D E F J L O Q R V X^c Y Z^{*}: facis...B C H Θ K M Mt. T W X^{*} Z^c*,' which tend to suggest to him the method of solution by counting heads.

The solitary assistance which, apart from our reliance on the editor's judgment, we receive in such a case as this, is the concise and cautious statement (p. x), 'Optimam vero textus formam plerumque videntur exhibere A (Δ S) Y H^{*} U; Ep^{*}; F; M; O X (X^c fere=A); Z^{*};' and it may, therefore, possibly not be without interest if we enter into more detail than Dr. Wordsworth has yet done on the history and possible relations of some of the MSS. of this 'best' class.

Most important, most celebrated, and of the most romantic fortunes, is Wordsworth's A, the *Codex Amiatinus*, so named from the monastery of Monte Amiata, the great hilltop familiar to all visitors of Siena and Central Tuscany, its last resting-place before it found its way to the Laurentian Library at Florence. It had been supposed from the colophon to the *capitula* of Leviticus, ὁ κύριος Σέββανδος αἰροῖήσεν, that the writer was the Servandus known as a friend of St. Benedict c. 540 A.D. But there are also dedicatory verses, which at present run thus:

*'Cenobium ad eximii merito venerabile Salvatoris
Quem caput ecclesiæ dedicat alta fides
Petrus Langobardorum extremis de finibus abbas
Devoti affectus pignora mitto mei
Meque meosque optans tanti inter gaudia patris
In cælis memorem semper habere locum.'*

Now the words we have italicized are with the exception of one or two letters later substitutions recording the gift of the MS. to Monte Amiata, and considerations both of metre and sense had long ago suggested that for *Salvatoris* we should read *Petri* and see a reference to St. Peter's at Rome. De Rossi,

the i
eviden
Bene
in his
we sh
Pope
the a
fully
Bible
erased
in the
the L
three
Old I
being
Vulga
earlier
codex
North
to col
sister
moder
awe,
north
disfar
centur
Utrech
Durha
nearly
codice
Of
most
ground
whose
tine, i
the S
about
mentio
case, w
'best'
the nin
course,

¹ Th
fuller de
when an

the illustrious epigraphist of the catacombs, combined this evidence with Bede's statement that Ceolfrid, successor of Benedict Biscop as abbot of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth, had in his old age taken a 'pandect of the new translation,' or, as we should say, a complete Vulgate Bible, as a present to the Pope. The proof was clenched by Dr. Hort's discovery that the anonymous Life of Ceolfrid, telling the same story more fully than Bede, actually quotes these verses as prefixed to the Bible thus brought to Rome from Northumbria, and the four erased words are now securely restored as 'Corpus . . . Petri' in the first line, 'Ceolfridus Anglorum' in the third. Between the Life and Bede we learn further that this MS. was one of three written by Ceolfrid's order to match a pandect of the Old Latin which he had brought from Rome, the other two being destined for the use of his two monasteries. Now these Vulgate MSS. thus written must have been transcribed from earlier copies already located in the library. The Amiatine codex, therefore, represents a type of text whose history in Northumbria probably dates back to Benedict's first endeavours to collect books, c. A.D. 670, while, when enshrined in the two sister codices to the magnificent volume which 'even on a modern spectator leaves an impression not far removed from awe,' it must have formed a sort of standard for the whole north of England.¹ Now we can see why the text of the Lindisfarne Gospels (Y) written about the beginning of the eighth century—the fragments of St. Matthew and St. John in the Utrecht Psalter (U), Northumbrian of about 700 A.D.—the Durham Gospels of the same date (Δ)—all present a text nearly identical with the Amiatine, from whose parent or sister codices they were probably copied direct.

Of this North British text the original stock would most naturally have come from Rome, the chosen hunting-ground of both the bibliophile abbots; and the Servandus whose name appears in the mutilated Greek of the Amiatine, if the writer of the *parent* MS. may really have been the Servandus who visited St. Benedict at Monte Cassino about A.D. 541, or the Servandus, also from Central Italy, mentioned a little later by St. Gregory the Great. In any case, we now remember that in another of Dr. Wordsworth's 'best' manuscripts, *Ep.*, written apparently at Echternach in the ninth century, is a note to the effect that 'it' (that is, of course, the *parent* MS., from whom the note passed over) was

¹ The curious story of the Amiatine MS. will be found set out with fuller detail in an earlier volume of this Review—'The Codex Amiatinus when and where written' (*C. Q. R.* vol. xxv. p. 435, January 1888).

corrected in A.D. 558 from a codex, 'quem ferunt fuisse S. Hieronymi,' then belonging to Eugippius, and Eugippius was abbot of Lucullanum, near Naples, at the beginning of the sixth century. The codex Fuldensis, too, which must now rank as the earliest Vulgate MS.—though its critical value is much diminished through its containing, not the four Gospels, but the translation of a harmony supposed by Victor, and, as we now know, rightly, to have been Tatian's—was written in the fifth decade of the same century by command of Victor, Bishop of Capua. A considerable proportion, then, of those MSS. which to Dr. Wordsworth approve themselves as 'best,' unite in throwing us back upon some common text prevalent in Latium and Campania in the sixth century, and separated by little more than a century from St. Jerome. Perhaps we may add that this was a region which from its Greek affinities would have received a Latin version later than other parts of the West, and where therefore the new text would find a less firmly seated rival to supplant, and would stand in less danger of subsequent and unconscious corruption.

But it is time to hasten on, and finally to attempt, by the selection and juxtaposition of the different renderings of a couple of passages—again from the Sermon on the Mount—to render more intelligible to our readers the relations and ramifications of various branches of Latin texts which have emerged from our inquiry. I. We take first the Lord's Prayer, not as a representative sample of changes made, but for exactly the contrary reason, that the changes in words so familiar to daily Christian use being inevitably as slight as possible, nothing but the main lines of cleavage might distract attention. Our standard text printed in full is the typical European MS. *b* rather than *a*, which has some African admixture; on the left are shown the variants of the specially African witnesses *k* Cyprian,¹ on the right those of the European-Italian *q* and the purely Italian *f*, followed by the Vulgate. Wherever variation is not noted in any of the side columns, it may be assumed that the reading agrees with *b*.

<i>k</i> Cyprian	<i>b</i>	<i>qf</i>	Vulg.
om. es <i>k</i>	Pater noster qui es in cælis sanctificetur nomen tuum	in cælis es <i>q</i>	[in cælis es] (1)

¹ In Cyprian the Lord's Prayer is extant entire in one of the treatises, the *De Dominica Oratione*, but only one or two fragments of it in the *Testimonia*; and the order of purity in the African text seems to be (1) L of the *Testimonia*; (2) *k*; (3) Cyprian's other treatises.

k C
veniat *k*

remitte *k*

remittere

* { passus
pati
induci nos

quoniam
tibi virtus
in secula
seculorum

Note
of cours
still not
more th
from the
one of c

In t
variation
in cælis
and ma
to Latin
where th
times, w
though i
x. 32, 3
and verb
were try
ungramm

<i>k</i> Cyprian	<i>b</i>	<i>qf</i>	Vulg.
veniat <i>k</i>	<i>adveniat</i> regnum tuum fiat voluntas tua in cælo et in terra panem nostrum <i>cotidianum</i>	[^] sicut <i>qf</i> terram <i>f</i>	[veniat] (2) [^] sicut supersubstan- tialem (3)
remitte <i>k</i> Cyp.	da nobis hodie et dimitte nobis	remitte <i>q</i> demitte <i>f</i>	dimitte
remittimus <i>k</i> (Cyp. ?)	debita nostra sicut et nos <i>remittimus</i> debitoribus nostris	dimittimus <i>qf</i>	dimittimus
[^] f passus fueris <i>k</i> [^] patiaris Cyp. induci nos <i>k</i> Cyp.	et ne [^] <i>nos inducas</i> in tentationem sed libera nos a malo	inducas nos <i>q</i>	inducas nos
quoniam est tibi virtus in secula seculorum <i>k</i>		quoniam tuum est regnum et virtus et gloria in secula amen <i>qf</i>	(1) many MSS. in cælis es (2) many MSS. veniat (3) some MSS. <i>cotidianum</i>

Note first the very large amount of uniformity—greater of course, as we have just said, than in ordinary cases, but still noteworthy as bearing on the doubt between one, or more than one, ultimate original of the Latin versions. Apart from the doxology, the words in which variation occurs in any one of our texts amount to less than a quarter of the whole.

In the African text lie, as might be expected, the chief variations: (1) The omission of *es* by *k* in the phrase *qui in cælis* (ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) is undoubtedly genuine African, and marks literal translation from the Greek without regard to Latin idiom. Out of seven other passages in St. Matthew where the same Greek words occur, *k* uses this rendering six times, while Cyprian's MSS. have usually *qui in cælis est*, though in one passage of the *Testimonia* (*Test.* iii. 16 = Matt. x. 32, 33), L gives twice *in cælis* omitting both relative and verb, which looks as if it were genuine and as if Cyprian were trying more than one way of emending an obviously ungrammatical Græcism of his version. With the *qui in*

cælis est of such passages we compare the *qui in cælis es* of *q* and many Vulgate MSS. in the Lord's Prayer. The alternative order *qui es in cælis* which appears (perhaps erroneously) in Cyprian's *De Dominica Oratione* is regularly European here and elsewhere. (2) More immediately noticeable is the variant *passus fueris* (Cyprian's MSS. less probably *patiariis*) *induci nos* for *εἰσεύγης*, a good instance of the second characteristic of earliest Biblical translations, the tendency to fill out by paraphrase their idea of the meaning of the original. Here, too, the African text stands alone, disturbance being, however, still manifest in the uncertain order of the words; *nos inducas* is European, *inducas nos* the Greek order being retained or restored by *q Vulg.* (3) *Veniat of k* for *ἐλθῶ* in the third clause is, in spite of Cyprian, no doubt the original African (cf. Matt. vii. 25, 27), surviving, strangely enough, in many Vulgate MSS. (4) The doxology is a less simple case. It is clear that the European texts had no doxology—that the Italian version introduced it from the Greek, *q* on a question of reading going naturally with *f*—and that Jerome from better and earlier Greek MSS. cut it out again. But what are we to say of *k*? Cyprian's detailed exegesis of the Lord's Prayer stops short of any doxology, and this negative evidence is weighty and independent of the quality of his MSS. Had the form in *k* been identical with that of the Italian MSS, we should have had little difficulty in dismissing it as an interpolation; but the greater simplicity (*virtus* instead of *regnum virtus gloria*) speaks for an earlier origin. Perhaps it is African but not the African text: sporadic not representative.¹

The Italian text signalizes its revised Greek character by inserting against its African and European predecessors the *sicut* of the third petition for the *κύθως* of the original, and again, as we have just said, by the doxology. The Vulgate, with its more scientific treatment, retains the *sicut* of all, and rejects the doxology of the inferior, Greek MSS., and adds to these various readings a very interesting variant rendering in its *supersubstantialem* for *cotidianum* of all other Latin texts representing the Greek *ἐπιούσιον*, though it is curious to remember that (as in the case of our own Authorized Version of the Psalms) Jerome's Lord's Prayer has never succeeded in establishing a foothold in the service books of the Church.²

¹ The evidence for the variants *dimitte* (*demitte*), *remitte*, *dimittimus*, *remittimus*, is too complicated to make discussion profitable.

² The only exception of which we can learn is a bilingual Lord's Prayer printed at the end of Muratori's Gelasian Sacramentary, after the end of the *capitula*. In the Sacramentary itself, though the prayer is not

Six o
Bibli
some
umbr
rupti
sion o
all the
Africa
cælis
(thoug
be rig
difficu

II.
Felices
ever e

plangen
quia k.

transf. (

heredita
sitient
et esu
quia C.

quoniam

{ miseri

{ conse

mundi C

ipsi C.

passi sun
causa ius

persecu
vos fue

et male
et dixer
adversu

omne m

propter
given in
is read a

Six of Dr. Wordsworth's MSS. even retain *cotidianum* in the Biblical text. These six, representing the Spanish and to some extent the British (to be distinguished from the Northumbrian) text, at once condemn themselves as liable to corruption from older versions. In the two other cases of division of the Vulgate MSS. *adveniat* has the support of nearly all the best MSS., and *veniat* is apparently an intruder from Africa. On the other hand, the equally European *qui in cælis es* is supported by most of the Bishop's 'best' class (though not by A) and by *q* as well, so that possibly it may be right. But even these instances will suffice to show the difficulty of constructing a final Vulgate text.

II. <i>k</i> Cyp.	<i>b</i>	<i>q f</i>	Vulg.
Felices Cyp. <i>wher-</i> (1) <i>Beati pauperes spiritu</i> <i>ever extant</i>	quoniam ipsorum est regnum cælorum		
plangentes C. <i>k</i>	(2) <i>beati qui lugent</i> quia <i>k</i>	qui lugunt <i>q f</i>	
<i>transf.</i> (2) (3) <i>k</i> (C.)	(3) <i>beati mites</i> quoniam ipsi hereditabunt C. <i>k</i> possidebunt terram sitientes (4) <i>beati qui esuriunt</i> { et esurientes C. <i>k</i> et sitiunt iustitiam quia C. <i>k</i> quoniam ipsi saturabuntur	mansueti <i>q f</i>	<i>transf.</i> (2) (3)
quoniam C. ipsi C. <i>k</i> quia <i>ipsis</i> { misericordiam <i>misereritur</i> consequentur C. <i>k</i> deus	(5) <i>beati misericordes</i> quoniam ipsi <i>q f</i> { miserabuntur <i>q</i> misericordiam consequentur <i>f</i>	quoniam ipsi { miserabuntur <i>q</i> misericordiam consequentur <i>f</i>	quoniam ipsi { misericordiam consequentur
mundi C. <i>k</i>	(6) <i>beati mundo corde</i> quoniam ipsi deum videbunt	mundi <i>f</i>	
<i>ipsi</i> C. <i>k</i>	(7) <i>beati pacifici</i> quoniam <i>ipsi</i> filii dei vocabuntur	<i>ipsi f.</i>	<i>ipsi</i> (some MSS.)
passi sunt C. <i>k</i> causa iustitiæ C. <i>k</i>	(8) <i>beati qui persecu-</i> tionem <i>patiuntur</i> <i>propter iustitiam</i> quoniam ipsorum est regnum cælorum		
persecuti vos fuerint	(9) <i>beati eritis cum</i> vos maledicent	exprobraverint vos (vobis homines <i>q</i>) et persequentur (persecuti fuerint <i>q</i>) et dixerint omne (verbum <i>q</i>) malum adversum vos mentientes propter me	estis maledixerint vobis et perse- cuti vos fuerint et dixerint omne malum adversum vos mentientes propter me
et maledixerint et dixerint adversum vos omne nequam propter iustitiam <i>k</i> propter iustitiam	et persequentur et dicent omne malum adversum vos		

given in full in the Canon, in the exposition to catechumens *quotidianum* is read and explained.

For the second passage for illustration we have selected the Beatitudes at the commencement of the Sermon on the Mount. In most of these verses *k* is reinforced by quotations in Cyprian's *Testimonia* which help us to restore a more exclusively African text, a text which consistently read *felix* for the otherwise universal *beatus*,¹ though the assimilating process has here induced *k* to desert to the European contingent. But a large residuum of readings remains where Cyprian and *k* agree against all other groups, such as the use of the present participle in the second and fourth Beatitudes, *plangentes, esurientes et sitientes*, a characteristic Africanism; the '*passi sunt causa iustitiæ*' of the eighth; the '*nequam*' (πονηρὸν) instead of *malum* of the last. Less unique is a series shared with *f*; *hereditabunt* against *possidebunt* of the rest (κληρονομήσουσι), where *a* tries to combine both with *hereditate possidebunt*; *mundi corde* for *mundo* of the rest; the addition of *ipsi* in the seventh Beatitude (corresponding to a similar variation in the Greek), supported this time by a few of the best Vulgate MSS. and Wordsworth's text; and again with the Vulgate *miserordiam consequentur* in the fifth, where the Europeans paraphrase '*ipsis miserebitur deus*', though the *miserabuntur* of *q* (ἐλεηθήσονται) looks most original of all. On the other hand the African text opposes *f*, while still retaining Vulgate support, in *miles* (= *a b*) for *mansueti* (*q f*) and in the order of the second and third Beatitudes.

The last Beatitude of all is an example of an unusual amount of variation between the various groups of texts. Differences in reading are illustrated by the African and European '*propter iustitiam*' changed into the Italian-Vulgate '*mentientes propter me*'; differences of rendering by the Italian *exprobrare* for the African, European, and Vulgate *maledicere* (Greek ἀνεδίξαι); differences of grammatical idiom by the future perfect of the African, Italian, and Vulgate against the future of the European.

If it is asked, to what purpose all this detail? the answer is not difficult. Apart entirely from historical, philological, and literary interest, there is no direction in which the textual criticism of the New Testament is likely to profit more than by the investigation of Latin evidence. The last generation has done probably nearly all that is necessary for the accurate collation of Greek manuscripts, our primary authorities; the next will find its work ready in the more rigorous and thorough enquiry into the testimony of Versions and Fathers.

¹ With Hartel's L B of the *Testimonia*, and some of the Oxford MSS. of Cyprian, as well as Optatus and perhaps Tertullian.

We
of the
in the
are lo
Sahid
Oxfon
of put
Latin
aid.
and h
menta
has, w
næus
versio
Tertu
it ema
would
based
collati
codice
if not
might
the Ne
poned
and di
manus
when
shall b
to say
what is
centur
New T
lines r
opport
the re
testimo
sifting
referen
sentati
gelists.

We have already a Greek text built up on the scientific study of the great uncial manuscripts; for the filling up of the gaps in the material on which the Cambridge Professors worked, we are looking soon for the Peshitto Gospels and it may be the Sahidic New Testament as well. But especially we trust that Oxford will continue and complete the task, so well initiated, of putting into the hands of scholars in a critical form all that Latin Fathers and Latin Biblical manuscripts can give us in aid. The Vulgate is safe in the hands of Bishop Wordsworth and his colleague, many years as it will be before that monumental edition reaches the Apocalypse. Professor Sanday has, we believe, in hand the Latin New Testament of Irenæus; and the question calls for settlement whether the version in which we read that Father already lay before Tertullian, or whether as Dr. Hort, following Dodwell, believes, it emanated from the fourth century only. Equally important would be a New (and indeed an Old) Testament of Cyprian based on a revision of Hartel's text. Next should come a recollation of the three great manuscripts now in North Italy, the codices of Vercelli, Verona, and Brescia; and the corrections, if not bulky enough to warrant a new edition of Bianchini, might be printed separately. The great task that remains, the New Testament of St. Augustine, must probably be postponed till the editors of the Vienna Corpus shall have examined and digested in print some of the vast stores of Augustinian manuscripts that fill every library of Western Europe. Then, when all this and other evidence is collected and collated, we shall be in a position to work back on the underlying texts, and to say, more clearly and more certainly than can be said now, what is the contribution of the Latin Churches from the second century to the fifth for the restoration of the original of the New Testament. We do not pretend to indicate here to what lines results would tend; for such a work we have neither opportunity nor fitness. But the already known closeness of the relation between some early Latin and early Oriental testimony is at least a problem which must receive a critical sifting and an explanation before a text constructed without reference to them can claim allegiance as the nearest representative of the authentic words of the Apostles and Evangelists.

ART. VII.—THE SCHOOLING OF THE APOSTLES.

Pastor Pastorum: or, the Schooling of the Apostles by our Lord.

By Rev. HENRY LATHAM, M.A., Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. (London, 1890.)

WE have found the work of the Master of Trinity Hall exceedingly fresh and suggestive, and we hope it will be of great use to a large, and perhaps an increasing, class of minds in which there is a mixture of reverence and enquiry, of true religion and keen interest in this wonderful world. We do not know any book which exactly supplies the want which the work aims at meeting. There are Lives of Christ orthodox and rationalistic, graphic and reflective. There are comments on His words and works both critical and devotional. It is not to be denied that in the perusal of this book one or other of these elements may sometimes be missed. When Mr. Latham advances some interesting and ingenious account of a saying or an act, those who are used to the Biblical criticism of the time may desire some discussion of the question whether a little variation from literal correctness in the record may not be the likeliest solution of the difficulty. And when he treats, in his easy style, of some incident in the sacred life, those who have been used to regard it awe-struck from a distance, may at first sight imagine him wanting in reverence. But the critics will find plenty of occupation for their faculty of enquiry in the interesting views of purpose and intention in the recorded words and work of Christ which are here set forth. The display of a unity of teaching in all the dealings of the Lord with His apostles is, in fact, a critical argument for the genuineness of the Gospel record of a very important kind, too often neglected by the critical school. The devotional reader, on the other hand, will discern no want of real reverence, although the deliberate purpose of the book is to bring out the points in which the Lord's teaching runs parallel with the best experience of ordinary human life rather than those in which it stands apart. The schooling of the Great Master is viewed as if by a university man of the best stamp, suspicious of transports, yet deeply careful of genuine truth. He is highly interested in watching the ways of human nature, and specially the growth and development of the minds of students. And therefore he regards with a delighted interest, which passes easily into devotion, the choice and training for a purpose infinitely important, of a

set
unfi
feel
instr
to sl
char
the
of se
stam
respo
often
soci
own
teach
learn
nativ
think
the S
the
the
inde
it b
Cath
we r
been
play
men
of t
Chu
upon
will
Gosp
open
diffe
have
lectu
Gosp
play
circu
a the
pract
suffer

set of men whom the best educationists might well deem as unfit to be instructed for any such destiny, as they would feel themselves at utter loss how to set about the process of instruction.

Naturally the first and favourite idea with Mr. Latham is to show how human liberty and the distinctness of individual character is valued and used by our Lord in His dealings with the Apostles.

'Christ, we find, draws out in His disciples the desired qualities of self-devotion and of healthy trust in God, without effacing the stamp of the individual nature of each man. He cherishes and respects personality. The leader of a sect or school of thought is often inclined to lose thought of the individual in his care for the society which he is establishing, or to expect his pupils to take his own opinions ready-made in a block. . . . But our Lord was a teacher of a very different kind. He revered whatever the learner had in him of his own, and was tender in fostering this native growth. He was glad when His words roused a man into thinking on his own account, even in the way of objection. When the Syrophenician woman turns His own saying against Him with the rejoinder, "Yes, Lord, yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs," He applauds her faith the more for the independent thought that went with it' (pp. 5-6).

This is well expressed and very true. And we may apply it by way of example to the Church of later times. The Catholic Church has been wider and freer than the sects, but we may well confess that even the Catholic Church has not been as Catholic as her Divine Founder in allowing for the play of individual character and patiently waiting its development. How admirably also may we note this characteristic of the Lord's dealings in His heavenly government of the Church after His Ascension. It is imperishably stamped upon the pages of the New Testament. The Tübingen critics will have it that men who took such different views of the Gospel as St. Paul and the Twelve, must needs have been at open war; that evangelists who regarded the life of Christ so differently as the Synoptists and St. John, cannot possibly have lived in the same age. But these expositors of the lecture-room were unable to understand the liberty of the Gospel or the wide scope for difference of aspect, and for the play of mental tendency, and the preparations of race and circumstance, which can find place in a system that is not a theory but a life.

'The training of the disciples,' says Mr. Latham, 'was partly practical, turning on what they saw our Lord do and were set or suffered to do themselves, and partly it came from what they heard

I want the reader to go along with me in marking how this training of the Apostles was adapted to generate the qualities which the circumstances of their situation demanded when Christ left the world' (p. 7).

The reader has no difficulty whatever in going along with Mr. Latham, for his detail of the elements of the Apostles' spiritual education is very interesting, and being founded on the general capacities and needs of humanity, is constantly felt to have its application to the Church in all time and to ourselves. First, the Apostles were chosen as good, honest, literal-minded men who would perform their chief duty of witnesses in such a manner as to win confidence. Then they were gradually schooled, through their companionship with the Lord during His wanderings, into confidence in His person and His life. They were trusted with responsibility when He sent them out two by two. And when He was taken from them by death, it was not long before He was again restored to them; and the same personal intercourse, with the same responsibility to work under Him among men, was re-established in a wider and more spiritual form. And in the Lord's oral teaching many characteristics lead us to mark that He was preparing His hearers for a work that was to grow and expand. His terse sayings, His parables, are seed-thoughts, meant and adapted to germinate within the mind and produce, not dull reciters of lessons by rote, but living thinkers and workers.

Mr. Latham would have us see in the omissions of the Gospels the same onward look towards future expansion. The Lord taught no ritual, because that is something which should vary according to times and places, and it would not have been well that what was fit for Judæa and for that age, should have been imposed upon Churches far removed in manners, language, and time. And the omission of a formal and doctrinal record by the Lord Himself of what He came to teach and do, has the same adaptation to the free growth of the Church. If the Lord had left writings, they would have been worshipped in the letter. They would have encouraged a bibliolatry which some indeed in later times, and under the pressure of revulsion from Rome, have tried to use towards the story of the Lord's life as we have it, but which it is not at all fitted to receive. For it is the record of the living tradition of the Apostles, committed to writing only at a considerable period after the Lord's death.

'When matter has come down by oral tradition men can hardly worship the letter of it. We possess only brief memoirs collected by

men, the dates and history of the composition of which are far from certain, so that room is left for criticism and judgment. The revelation of God is, therefore, not so direct that men will be awe-stricken and shut their minds at the sight of it ; but human intelligence can be brought to bear on the records, whereby their meaning is brought out, and men's intellects are braced by the exploration of lofty regions' (p. 14).

It is very easy, indeed, to see how much better this character of the Gospel records falls in with the Catholic than with the Protestant theory. According to the latter conception the Church fills the position of a servant who respectfully furnishes us with a Bible and retires, leaving us to make what we can of it by ourselves. But the Church has ever been a living teacher and witness to men, and something more still ; she has been the living body in which men think and grow, and which thinks and grows with them into ever-increasing familiarity with Him who is the head. Mr. Latham very rightly notes the peculiar fitness of memoirs by contemporaries, or those who were familiar with contemporaries, to make us acquainted with people in their own intimate character. It is, we suppose, this adaptation of memoirs to enable us to know personalities—not what men did, but what they were—which gives them a charm so much greater than formal history. We desire to know formal history in order to trace the world-movements of races and kingdoms. But, for our own delight and improvement, we must have from each great period, and each centre of important events, some diary or collection of letters composed at ease, without formality or the design of completeness, to teach us what sort of men these were in themselves, apart from the great historical results which force us to think of them less as men than as impersonal powers. And the deepest, truest, holiest instance of this fitness of memoirs to acquaint us with a personality is furnished by the Gospels.

Mr. Latham very happily takes the words of St. Paul, 'the secret things of their hearts are made manifest,' for the burden of his chapter upon Revelation. For its leading thought is that God is revealed to us in the revelation of ourselves. It is in this character that God's messages are presented to us even in the Old Testament : as things true in themselves and harmonizing all man's knowledge, intellectual and moral—something which every true man is bound to accept by its self-evidencing nature and its consistency with everything that he knows. But above all does this appear in the manifestation of Jesus Christ. When He comes,

and the Father draws a soul to Him, every hidden impulse springs up at His word and does its part in recognizing Him that is true: every deceitful lust hides itself in shame, and the prince of this world stands convicted as a lying spirit.

'This,' Mr. Latham finely says, 'was what drew men so mightily to Him. It was not so much the novelty of what He told them that attracted them, as that they recognized in His teaching old familiar puzzles which had come and gone through their minds times without number, only in such shadowy guise that they could not fix and scrutinize them. Christ spake, and then men said, "This is what has been always troubling us." Here is what we have been always wanting to say, and could not put into plain words—and now these floating impressions of ours are found not to have come by chance, but to belong to truths set in our being. God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father. But He would not have done so if we had not had the capacity for being sons to begin with' (pp. 71, 72).

It will be very plain to students of the Apostles' preaching in the Acts, and of their communications with their converts in the Epistles, that the very same characteristic power of revealing men to themselves continues to mark the religion of Christ after His departure, both in its first acceptance by converts and in its abiding influence over mature Christians.

The miracles of the Lord are regarded by Mr. Latham in the character of signs or striking exhibitions of the nature of His power and the principles of His work.

'Our assurance that they occurred is to be based both on the external evidence, which in this case is the testimony to the authenticity of the record, and on the internal probability, which comes out of the conformity of the miracles with the laws of Christ's action and the declared purpose of His coming' (p. 67).

There is no doubt that the place which the miracles occupy in the structure of the faith has changed so considerably of late years that it might not be untrue to say that, whereas our fathers believed in Christ because of His miracles, we believe in His miracles because of Him. It is very instructive to note how many of those sayings of our Lord which display, in the subtlest and most inimitable form, His method of dealing with souls, occur in inextricable union with some miraculous narrative. The miracles are not wonderful stories. The tendency to accumulate wonderful stories originates in the love of the marvellous, and the love of the marvellous is clearly to be discerned, not only in the folk-lore of all nations, but in the miraculous stories which the lives of the saints record, even though the great model which lay before their authors

in th
and
such
scen
sens
tion
too
to b
to th
mind
imbu
same
prec
by fo
any
Lord
chap
C
work
work
Tem
pers
'cloth
be th
of si
provi
to su
sake
will r
will r
men
looph
most
seems
lies m
tion.
God
moral
sonsh
baptis
His s
they
sonsh
ment
which

in the Gospels imposes upon the narratives a certain restraint and a spiritual character. But in the Gospels, which had no such previous model to restrain them from expatiating in scenes of wonder, there is the strictest subordination of the sense of wonder to the idea of spiritual use, of the imagination to the moral faculty. The stories of the miracles are far too full of spiritual refinement and personal traits of character to be attributable to popular legend. And if we ascribed them to the studied invention of literary genius, what inexplicable minds must their authors have possessed; how wonderfully imbued with the spirit and manner of Jesus, while at the same time willing to offend in their own persons against His precepts of truth, and to outrage His dignity and simplicity by forcing on Him the character of a miracle-worker without any ground in fact. The true place of the miracles in the Lord's system of training is well drawn out by Mr. Latham in chap. iv.

Chap. v. contains a detailed treatment of the laws of the working of signs observed by our Lord, and regarded as worked out for Him by His own awful experience in the Temptation, the narrative of which Mr. Latham regards as personally communicated by Him to His Apostles, and 'clothed by Him in a garb of outward imagery, that it might be the better understood' (p. 118). The laws of the working of signs are—that miracles will not provide what might be provided by human endeavour; will not be used by the Lord to supply His own wants; will not be worked for miracle's sake apart from some object of benevolence or instruction; will not be worked to supplement human policy; and, lastly, will not be of such an overwhelming character as to terrify men into acceptance, or so unanswerably certain as to leave no loophole for unbelief. No doubt these are perfectly true and most important rules of the Gospel miracles. But there seems to us that there is still another, and that the one which lies most plainly upon the face of the narrative of the Temptation. Miracles will not be worked as the marks of sonship to God; for sonship consists not in physical powers but in moral relations. The temptations are all grounded upon the sonship of the Lord, which had just been declared in His baptism. They all suggest to Him methods of exercising His sonship which the Evil One regards as appropriate, and they are all rejected by Him for the sake of adherence to a sonship which submits to pain and privation and self-abasement in this world, but retains that dependence upon God in which the true filial relation consists.

Mr. Latham is no doubt right in believing that the narrative of the Temptation was communicated to His Apostles by our Lord. There is no other conceivable source of the information, unless we suppose a miraculous illumination of the Evangelists in respect of facts; a source of knowledge which does not correspond to St. Luke's claim of communication with those who were eye-witnesses. And we could well conceive that the Lord would throw the narrative into a form fitted for the comprehension of His hearers. Yet when we are required to regard it as 'an apologue or species of parable in which our Lord, after Eastern fashion, introduced Satan as an embodiment of the powers of evil' (p. 126), we confess that we cannot follow. Even if the story were an apologue it could not but be meant to teach that temptations of this sort actually did come to the Lord. And why, then, should we not take it as a direct record of actual temptations, in the internal sphere if you will, but yet real. And as there can be no doubt, from our Lord's whole history, that He believed in the personality of the Tempter, why should we conceive that the Tempter's person on this occasion merely represents evil under a symbol.

Mr. Latham tells us, no doubt with the most perfect sincerity, that 'in giving up here the personality of the tempter' he is making no abatement of what is superhuman in the Gospel in order to win the doubters. He is quite right in thinking that the concession would be vain for any such purpose. For when we regard the Temptation as a part of the history of our Lord's moral life, we are compelled to admit that, whether the enticements to evil came to Him in His mind within, or to His outward senses, He regarded them as coming from beyond His own personality, and as invested with a malignant life and personal energy which show that His view of sin was founded upon principles radically different from those who regard it as the result of circumstances and material forces.

Mr. Latham notes (p. 156 *sq.*) some interesting points in the relations of the Apostles to one another. Five of them were native Galilæans who had come together to Bethabara to hear the Baptist, and were drawn into the service of the Lord upon His return from the desert. And a permanent tie exists among them. St. John introduces their names even when naming would seem unnecessary. Thus, he mentions Andrew as the disciple who said, 'There is a lad here who hath five barley-loaves,' while the Synoptists, in recording the miracle, give no name. Thus Philip, who is scarce mentioned by the Synoptists, is six times named by St. John,

and
Nath
Bart
Apo
toget
list,
John
belie
they

listen
ready
and t
his li
yet h
were
kind
St. M

In
such
life a
of H
the fi
was
rejoic
comm
His t

In
Latha
conce
Jesus
withi
own
It mu
tion o
of the
The a
our ov
makes
of ou
author
Churc

Th
they v
VOL

and appears now in company with Andrew and now with Nathanael. And in the same way Andrew, Philip, and Bartholomew form one clause in the enumeration of the Apostles by St. Mark, as if they had been used to keep together. But it is of greater interest to note St. Matthew's list, which is given in pairs—Simon and Andrew, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, and so forth. Mr. Latham believes that the Apostles were paired in this order when they went out upon their mission during the Lord's lifetime.

'The Evangelist had in his eye the party as they had stood listening to their Master's words, with their staves in their hands, ready to start. He recollects their separating—two going one way and two another, and therefore two by two he puts them down in his list. It is curious that though St. Matthew couples the names, yet he does not say, as St. Mark and St. Luke do, that the Apostles were sent two and two together. The coupling in St. Matthew is a kind of coincidence with that express direction which is preserved by St. Mark and St. Luke' (pp. 162-3).

It is a striking remark of Mr. Latham (pp. 177-8) that such gleams of gladness as came to our Lord in His suffering life are never for His own sake, or even for the future triumph of His cause, but for the career which He sees opening before the friends at His side, and for that faithfulness to Him which was the spring of their spiritual progress. For this He rejoices in spirit and thanks the Father, and for this He commends them as those who have continued with Him in His temptations.

In his chapter upon the Preaching to the Multitudes, Mr. Latham draws out (p. 203 *sq.*) the principles on which, as he conceives, the authority which men found in the words of Jesus consisted. The first was that He 'brought to birth within men thoughts which were lying in embryo in their own hearts.' This is certainly an element of all true authority. It must have an inward testimony. Mere strength of assertion or of threat can but procure a dead and formal submission of the mind, while mere force cannot reach the mind at all. The authority which really enslaves our hearts must represent our own best, our ideal selves; we must be conscious that it makes of us something more than we could ever have made of ourselves. And this, which is the character of the authority of Christ, is a pattern for the authority of the Church.

The second principle is that He not only told them that they were the children of God, but treated them as such.

VOL. XXXI.—NO. LXI.

I

'Man as man has, in His eyes, a right to respect. Anger we find with our Lord often, as also surprise at slowness of heart, indignation at hypocrisy and at the Rabbinical evasions of the law ; but never, in our Lord's words or looks, do we find personal disdain. Towards no human being does He show contempt. The Scribe would have trodden the rabble out of existence ; but there is no such thing as rabble in our Lord's eyes' (p. 204).

The idea that everything belonged to God and was to be reverently regarded lay, Mr. Latham thinks, deep in the hearts of the children of Israel, and the Lord brought it to light. And certainly, in the unity and omnipotence of God in which they believed so firmly, there lay the source of universal regard for every living thing. But when we consider the attitude of the Jews towards foreign nations and their neighbours the Samaritans, we see that it was but as an embryo thought that respect for man, as man, dwelt in them. Their knowledge of God was to them a source of pride and hatred : it was for the Lord to show them its proper consequence and application.

Thirdly, there was in the Lord's teaching no forced or studied condescension to the capacities of His hearers, as if they were unfit to enter into the ideas upon which He Himself lived. This was the way of the Scribes. This people, said they, which knoweth not the law are cursed ; but, as they must be taught something, they shall have what they are able to comprehend, and must be grateful to us, who know so much more, yet are good enough to speak to them. But, as Mr. Latham shrewdly says, 'there is nothing that men, young or old, so surely detect as whether a man serves them with the same thoughts that he gives to himself and his friends.' The Lord's condescension to human nature is real and not assumed, and leaves no room for the secret feeling that He is not admitting us into His own personal principles of thought and action. The mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven which He reveals are mysteries, not because of any refusal on His part to initiate us into them, but simply from our own failure to reach the height of the great lesson which He so freely opens. And when a teacher treats us so, we feel that our only chance of advance in knowledge is close and continued companionship with Him. In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Fourthly, 'our Lord assumes a certain positive authority by putting His own commands in contrast to the written law.' This, of course, has been often noticed. But Mr. Latham follows it out by observing how He supersedes the

law
high
but
own
of a
delib
cont
conf
whic
to C
Lor
taug
who
woul
into
says
than
being
some
wom
that
of w
V
ing
the c
posit
it to
must
appr
be le
selfis
about
prete
E
sligh
in th
temp

law without rejecting it—fulfils it by including it in His own higher and truer precepts. He 'never attributes it to God, but always either to Moses or them of old time,' and His own command so widely oversteps it as to bear the character of a repeal. But why, it may be asked, did our Lord never deliberately teach the people in what sense their sacred books contained the word of God? It would have caused utter confusion and bewilderment if He had. Those minds to which the law itself had been a schoolmaster to bring them to God were prepared for the higher moral lesson which the Lord delivered. The law in its practical operation had taught both its own power and its own imperfection to those who had best tried to practise it. But these very people would have been puzzled and perplexed had they been led into abstract questions of inspiration and authority. 'Nothing,' says Mr. Latham, 'in our Lord's wisdom strikes me more than His moderation with regard to error.' We are complex beings, and if the tares be too rudely rooted out of our minds some truth will go with them. 'Take away from an Italian woman her belief in the Virgin, or from a Scotch peasant that in the sacred obligation of the Sabbath, and a great deal of what is best in them will go too' (p. 208).

When Mr. Latham adds that 'our Lord's way of proceeding is always positive,' he names the necessary antidote to the danger of these thoughts. For if without firm belief in positive truth upon our own part, and a decided will to teach it to others, we begin to ask ourselves whether partial error must not always adhere to the form in which the multitude apprehend the truth, there is no knowing how far we may be led. Our charity may run into cynical acquiescence for selfish ends; and as some continue in sin that grace may abound others content themselves with uncorrected error under pretence of Christian largeness of mind.

But we have filled our space, though we have given but a slight account of less than half the passages we had marked in this interesting book. We trust we have said enough to tempt the thoughtful reader into studying it for himself.

ART. VIII.—WATKINS'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

Modern Criticism Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel: being the Bampton Lectures for 1890. By HENRY WILLIAM WATKINS, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Durham. (London, 1890.)

ARCHDEACON WATKINS is careful to inform us that the subject of his lectures is limited to the consideration of the Gospel of St. John. In his able and well-filled volume there are no doubt many arguments and considerations which have a bearing on other books of Scripture; but, in justice to the author, it is right to keep this limitation in view. It is the object of the lectures to determine how far the boast so frequently put forward, that modern criticism has cancelled the judgment of the ages in favour of the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, has real ground. The answer is not doubtful. It may safely be affirmed that all the attacks made upon the Gospel have been repelled, and that at the present moment it stands upon firmer and surer ground than it did before.

Such assertions are, indeed, easily made; but they are not the mere assertions of an anonymous reviewer. Almost the last earthly act of Bishop Lightfoot was again to challenge a verdict on the subject of St. John.¹ Nor is this all. A scholar equally distinguished—we mean Ewald, who cannot be suspected of an undue bias in favour of orthodoxy—so long ago as 1863, wrote in the following terms:—

‘Those who since the first discussion of this question have been really conversant with it never could have had, and never have had, a moment's doubt. As the attack on St. John has become fiercer and fiercer, the truth during the last ten or twelve years has been

¹ For another reason the touching words of Bishop Lightfoot deserve to be given. He says: ‘Whatever consequences may follow from it we are compelled on critical grounds to accept this Fourth Gospel as the genuine work of John, the son of Zebedee. . . . As a critical question I wish to take a verdict upon it. But as I could not have you think that I am blind to the theological issues directly or indirectly connected with it, I will close with this brief confession of faith. I believe from my heart that the truth which this Gospel more especially enshrines—the truth that Jesus Christ is the very Word incarnate, the manifestation of the Father to mankind—is the one lesson which, duly apprehended, will do more than all our feeble efforts to purify and elevate human life here by imparting to it hope and light and strength, the one study which alone can fitly prepare us for a joyful immortality hereafter’ (*Expositor*, March 1890, p. 188, quoted by Watkins, *Lectures*, p. 165).

more and more solidly established, error has been pursued into its last hiding-places, and at this moment the facts before us are such that no man who does not will knowingly to choose error and to reject truth can dare to say that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John.¹

If such words could be used then, how much more applicable are they now. Since Ewald wrote, the controversy has been enriched by the labours of many distinguished scholars. We have had the essays of Lightfoot in reply to the author of *Supernatural Religion*, in which he exploded innumerable fallacies; but, above all, we have had his splendid vindication of the Epistles of Ignatius, a work which, it may safely be said, administered the death-blow to the Tübingen theory. Then, in addition to this, we have had on St. John the labours of Professor Sanday and Bishop Westcott, and the deep learning, powerful common-sense, and calm judgment of Dr. Salmon, not to speak of the valuable work of many other scholars outside our Church. Nay, it may even be said—with reverence we may venture to do so—that Providence itself has mingled in the fray. Since the controversy began we have had a series of discoveries of ancient documents, all of which have contributed somewhat in favour of the Gospel of St. John. Through the works of Hippolytus recently brought to light we can trace back the Gospel to the reign of Trajan, and into the heart of the school of St. John. We can see that it was then accepted as a *Λόγιον* or inspired oracle, both by heretics and orthodox. Let the reader weigh well what that means. It means that at the period when this fugitive ray of light impinges on the Church, every native Christian at Ephesus and the surrounding cities, who, like Polycarp, was then from forty to fifty years old, must have seen and heard and venerated for many years of their lives the blessed apostle. How is it conceivable that they could have received and revered a document professing to come from him unless they were well assured that such was the case? That they did so receive and reverence the Gospel is plain from St. Ignatius, whose mind, so to speak, is saturated with its doctrine.

And yet in spite of all this we have the frequent assertion that modern criticism has disproved the genuineness of St.

¹ Quoted by Watkins, p. 251. Quoted also, with approval, by Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, 1886, p. 220, ed. 13. Regarding similar words of Ewald, Bishop Westcott remarks: 'For the rest Ewald's calm and decisive words are, I believe, simply true' (*Introduction to the Gospels*, p. x, ed. 3).

John's Gospel. We hardly think that anyone who has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts could at the present moment make the assertion. But it must be borne in mind that this question of criticism is intimately bound up with other issues. A man may be convinced on other grounds that the miracles and teaching of our Gospel are delusive; and from idiosyncrasy, or other cause, he may even be fanatical in his advocacy of this view. If such is the case he will find it hard to believe that the Gospel really came from an apostle and eyewitness. He will naturally lay stress on every argument which is advanced on his own side; and notwithstanding the reasoning of opponents, of which perhaps he has an imperfect knowledge, may still believe that his cause is the truth. But, however this may be, it is certain that much pains have been taken by sceptical writers to instil into the public mind the idea that the victory is on their side. Nor are such efforts confined to the higher walks of literature; they are equally visible in the sphere of novels and light literature. As a specimen of the sort of ideas that are propagated in popular works, Archdeacon Watkins has quoted the following from *Robert Elsmere* :—

‘He paused, and then very simply, and so as to be understood by those who heard him, he gave a rapid sketch of that great operation worked by the best intellect of Europe during the last half-century—broadly speaking—on the facts and documents of primitive Christianity. From all sides and by the help of every conceivable instrument those facts have been investigated, and now at last the great result—the revived, reconceived truth—seems ready to emerge.’¹

These words are put in the mouth of a fictitious personage, who is characterized by the Archdeacon as a ‘weak and certainly ill-informed young clergyman.’ The Archdeacon can easily picture the man and take an accurate survey of his intellectual furniture. Unhappily many of the readers of this popular novel are unable to do so; and we know not how far they may be impressed by this confident assertion of the conclusion at which ‘the best intellect of Europe,’ working ‘on the facts and documents of primitive Christianity,’ has arrived.

If this were a question of science, or of some point in mere history, such assertions, so far beside the mark, might be safely left to fall by their own weight. Unhappily the case

¹ Mrs. Humphry Ward, *Robert Elsmere*, iii. 206. Quoted in Watkins's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 170.

is very different here. The claims of Divine revelation on the soul are very great; and most of us, especially the young, find it very difficult to satisfy them. How much will that difficulty be increased if the idea is suggested that, after all, those claims are baseless. We can picture the struggle in many a young heart, and we can imagine how the reading of such assertions may form a turning-point in their lives. They have no means of testing their truth, and chiming in, as they do, with natural inclination, they may be accepted as fact. The consequence is that they are alienated from God and the claims of God, and, spiritually speaking, their life is ruined. They have lost for ever all that they might have been, and are only brought back, if they are brought back, through bitter suffering. It is plain we cannot stand aside in presence of such an evil without trying to do something by way of abatement; and it appears to have been some such feeling that suggested the present course of *Bampton Lectures*.

Archdeacon Watkins tells us how, walking one day with Bishop Lightfoot when it was hoped the Bishop was regaining strength, he put to him the question, how he accounted for the fact of the frequent assertion that the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel had been disproved by modern criticism, in the presence of the strong and accumulating evidence in its favour? The Bishop did not directly reply, but the suggestion was made that the subject might be treated in a course of *Bampton Lectures*. Subsequently the Archdeacon drew up a scheme, and it obtained the sanction of the Bishop in the following terms:—

‘I have read your scheme and entirely approve of it. No subject could be more useful at the present day, and I think the time has arrived when it could be effectively treated. Of course it will take much time, but it will be worth the expenditure.

‘J. B. DUNELM.’

The Bishop did not live to see the completion of the work, and he is therefore responsible for no more than a general approval. But we can sincerely congratulate the Archdeacon on what he has accomplished. What we especially admire in his book is the clearness of the divisions of the subject, together with the multitude of valuable materials that he has assembled within these divisions. Many will be surprised at the extent and accuracy of his learning; and, owing to the multitude of the references, we can imagine no book that will be more useful to the young student who wishes to master the subject.

The first three lectures are devoted to defining and depicting the judgment of the ages ; and we may first of all remark on this part of the subject. The Archdeacon begins with the latter part of the second century. He then goes back to the middle period ; and from that to the generation which in its youth was contemporary with St. John. This is the mode of procedure generally adopted, and it is by far the most convenient. The writings of the earlier parts of the century are but scanty ; and it is only in the last years that the literature becomes abundant and enables us to see what the Church really held and taught. Our author summons as witnesses Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, Theophilus, Melito and Apollinarius, and Polycrates. They represent the whole extent of the Church as it then existed, viz. the Churches of Gaul, of Alexandria, of Africa and Rome, of Antioch, and of Asia Minor. Nor is their witness doubtful. We see from their writings that nearly all the books of our present New Testament, the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles, were received by these Churches, and received as divine or inspired writings, and that they were read in their churches. There is, in fact, no question as to the witness of the Church in the end of the second century. Even Strauss admits it, although he is singularly blind as to the consequences of the admission. Dr. Salmon pertinently asks how long a time would it require for our Gospels to have attained that position which we see from Irenæus they had attained in the Church of his day. Not less, Dr. Salmon thinks, than fifty years. The estimate is a modest one ; but even so it carries us back far beyond the middle of the century, and almost within touch of the Apostle St. John.

From the end of the century the author passes on to consider the second generation. Here again we have as witnesses Justin Martyr, Tatian, the Clementines, and, as representing heretics, the Valentinians. From all of these may be gathered clear testimonies to the use of our Gospels, and especially to that of St. John. We commend to the reader's attention the full and careful way in which our author has treated Justin, bringing to bear upon the subject all the fresh light which has recently come to hand. In regard to Justin facts have been too strong for our opponents. For, not to speak of Dr. Salmon's fifty years, the recent discovery of Tatian's Diatessaron places it beyond doubt that Justin must have known and used our four Gospels. Equally unfortunate has been their fate in regard to the Clementines. The old manuscript from which this book was known was defective,

bre
deal
stren
deni
time
Vati
unkn
by L
quot
cover
unde
long
Harr
fact
book
midd
the s
regre
towa
midd
the v
how
of th
V
nesse
porar
of B
has s
now
struc
expo
Bisho
latter
gathe
pictu
centu
detai
faithf
hear
well a
heart
single
the e
impli
ingen

breaking off in the middle of the nineteenth Homily; and dealing with this defective copy, Baur and his school had strenuously denied that St. John's Gospel was quoted, such denial being considered essential to their theory. All the time, however, a manuscript in the Ottobonian library at the Vatican was in existence, which contained the hitherto unknown portion of the Homilies; and when it was published by Dr. Albert Dressel it was found to contain an undoubted quotation from St. John. But the greatest of these discoveries, as bearing on the middle of the second century, is undoubtedly the discovery of Tatian's Diatessaron. It is no longer doubtful that Tatian, the pupil of Justin, composed a Harmony of our four Gospels. How much is involved in this fact? Is it not clear that the same position which our sacred books held at the end of the century they held also in the middle? To Justin and his contemporaries they were exactly the same as they were to Irenæus. And hence the fifty years' regress of Dr. Salmon must commence, not with Irenæus towards the end, but with Justin's *floruit*, at or previous to the middle. We are thus carried back beyond the year 100 to the very time when St. John's Gospel was composed. And how must this react upon our judgment in regard to the ideas of the first generation?

When we come to the first generation we have as witnesses Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, all of whom were contemporaries or disciples of St. John. It is here that the labours of Bishop Lightfoot have told with the greatest effect. He has swept away many fallacies regarding Papias, and there is now very little doubt that the aim of Papias was not to construct a traditional history of our Lord, but to illustrate and expound our four Gospels. We have already spoken of the Bishop's vindication of the Ignatian Epistles. Through this latter work, illustrated as it is by a vast amount of materials gathered from contemporary and other sources, we get a picture of the school of St. John at the commencement of the century which is almost photographic in the minuteness of its details. We can see Ignatius, Polycarp, the bishops and faithful of Asia Minor as real and living personages. We can hear their words, and can take account of the high aims, as well as the anxieties and deep emotions, which swayed their hearts. It is true that the remains of this period, with the single exception of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, are scanty in the extreme. And it is also true that what they have said or implied in regard to our Gospels and other books may by ingenious reasoning be explained away. But it must be

remembered that these were the men who handed on the Gospels to the generation which succeeded. In what capacity did they hand them on? Was it as ordinary books, which might be altered, re-edited, or improved? Or was it as divine oracles, which it were sacrilege to touch, and which must be kept, guarded, cherished, and venerated as a light from on high? It is here that the great fact of Tatian's Diatessaron, and all that it implies, comes in with almost startling effect. The Gospels could never have taken the position which we know from Tatian they then had, if they had not been delivered to the middle generation as divine books.

Having thus in his first two lectures treated of the second century, the author in the third traces briefly the history of the Canon down to its close in the East and in the West. He then passes lightly over the intermediate period, to consider the changes brought about at the Reformation. There was no change in the estimation of the sacred books viewed as the Word of God. But the exigencies of controversy with the Roman Catholics gradually drove the Protestants to a conception of inspiration which was quite new. It was the idea of a mechanical or literal inspiration—in other words, the inspiration of a *book*. This view was quite foreign to the idea of the second century, which believed rather in inspired *men*. The underlying idea of the second century view was that Christ had commissioned His Apostles to be His witnesses to the world, and had promised His Spirit to bring all things to their remembrance, and to guide them into all truth. They were *πνευματοφόροι*, spirit-bearing men, as Theophilus of Antioch calls them; and no book could have a place in the Canon unless it could be traced back to one or other of them, or had apostolic sanction. That this view belongs to the earliest period of the Church is evident from the election of Matthias, from St. Paul's anxiety to vindicate his apostolic dignity as having seen Christ and been commissioned directly by Him, and from the preface of St. Luke. It was only those who were both eye-witnesses and ministers of the word who could deliver a gospel. This view, which is at once higher and more worthy of Christ, is very different from the idea of book inspiration; and our author shows that the latter view has never been accepted by the Church generally, or by the Church of England. It is equally foreign to the teaching of the Roman Church, if we may accept Cardinal Newman as its exponent. The Cardinal's statement reproduces in substance the view of the second century, and is worthy of attention. He says:—

Scripture
an in-
men
ing th
proph
of the
inspir
langu
and s
in un
called

I
autho
attac
on th
forma
lectu
time
ture
schoo
divid
and t
with
schol
lish
being
docum
then
some

T
to att
our o
with
follow
excee
for a
tempt
point

T
the er
and l
dissert

¹ V
Canon

'These two Councils (the Tridentine and Vatican) decide that the Scriptures are inspired, and inspired throughout, but not inspired by an immediately divine act, but through the instrumentality of inspired men ; that they are inspired in all matters of faith and morals, meaning thereby, not only theological doctrine, but also the historical and prophetic narratives which they contain, from Genesis to the Acts of the Apostles ; and lastly, that, being inspired because written by inspired men, they have a human side, which manifests itself in the language, style, tone of thought, character, intellectual peculiarities, and such infirmities, not sinful, as belong to our nature, and which in unimportant matters may issue in what in doctrinal matters is called an *obiter dictum*.'¹

Having thus dealt with the judgment of the ages, the author next proceeds to consider the great and memorable attack made upon New Testament documents, and especially on the Gospel of St. John. This, together with the defence, forms the subject of the succeeding lectures. In the fourth lecture he relates the first beginnings of the contest up to the time when, in 1845, it culminated in Strauss. The fifth lecture is devoted, in the first part, to Baur and the Tübingen school, and in the second to other opponents, which last he divides into two classes, viz. the advocates of partition theories, and the purely negative school. In the sixth lecture he begins with the defence, and passes in review a long list of foreign scholars, concluding with some account of the labours of English defenders. The seventh lecture is an important one, being taken up with an account of recent discoveries of ancient documents, and their bearing on the great controversy. And then follows the concluding lecture, which gives results, and some considerations of a general nature.

The extent of ground thus covered is far too great for us to attempt to follow, and we must select some part of it for our observations. Probably the attack is that which carries with it the greatest interest, and we could have wished to follow the author through the whole. Yet to do so would far exceed our limits. We must refer the reader to our author for a connected account of the attack, and all we shall attempt will be to offer a few observations on some salient points.

The Christian Church from the very beginning, and up to the end of the last century, has believed in the genuineness and Divine authority of the Gospel of St. John. Not one dissentient voice has been heard, if we except the faint

¹ *What is of obligation for a Catholic to believe concerning the Canonical Scriptures*, 1884, pp. 4-5. Quoted by Watkins, p. 158.

murmurs of a shadowy body of supposed heretics named by Epiphanius—the Alogi. It was towards the end of the last century or beginning of the present that the mutterings of the coming storm were heard. And, strange to say, at the head of the attack stands the name of an Englishman named Evanson. We have often wondered, seeing his name repeated in list after list, what sort of a personage he might be; for the memory of him has faded from the present generation. Archdeacon Watkins has taken the trouble to look him up, and the account he gives of him is very amusing. We can imagine that the critics, his successors, would be somewhat astonished at the results at which he arrives. We cannot, however, spend time over him. It is enough to say that he is equally remarkable in regard to what he accepts as to what he rejects. While he rejects as spurious both the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Romans, he is strenuous in maintaining the authenticity of St. Luke and the Acts. In respect of one point, however, Evanson is really deserving of his place, and is the real inaugurator of the new system. He was the first to apply in criticism the principle of divination or guessing—a principle which enters into and really forms the backbone of all subsequent negative criticism, and which was carried to a ridiculous extreme by Renan. It will be found, in fact, all through this great controversy that while defenders appeal to facts, or to inductions from facts, the attack relies mostly on some ingenious theory divined *à priori*, and resting on the slenderest basis of fact. The Tübingen theory is an illustration of this. It was constructed *à priori*, and could only appeal to the very slenderest indications by way of facts, while, on the other hand, nearly all the most assured facts and documents of primitive Christianity had to be swept away before it could even find a place in history.

But, though the contest thus began in England, the battle had to be fought in Germany. We may pass over, as unimportant, the first attempts to deal with the Johannine problem, and come at once to Bretschneider. It was with him that the real battle began; for, as Strauss remarks, he was the first who dealt with the Johannine question in a way worthy of modern scientific requirements. It is well, in estimating Bretschneider's attack, to recollect the circumstances which gave it in some measure its character and significance. In 1806 and 1807 occurred the great invasion of Germany by Napoleon, which entailed upon the nation so much cruel oppression and humiliation. It was this invasion which led to the foundation, in 1810, of the university of Berlin, which

at c
illus
who
the
was
nati
and
lishe
of c
Bret
ther
sent
It is
assu
schn
relig
St. J
expe
in hi
revel
was
calm
To s
appe
Whe
have
possi
the g
V
good
Wat
schn
the c
opini
again
cultie
He w
the s
rested
Natur
John
ing w
'B
sions v
an ora

at once assumed the highest rank in consequence of the illustrious names, Schleiermacher, Neander, and De Wette, who were among its first teachers. Then followed, in 1813, the great uprising through which the tide of French conquest was rolled back to the Rhine and Paris. The heart of the nation was profoundly moved by these stupendous events, and they were still recent when, in 1821, Bretschneider published his book. But what we have to note is that it was out of circumstances connected with these great events that Bretschneider's book arose. All through the great contest there had been, as was natural, a rekindling of the religious sentiment, and at the head of the revival stood Schleiermacher. It is necessary to bear in mind the attitude which this latter assumed, and the nature of his system, from which in Bretschneider we have a recoil. In Schleiermacher we have a religion of feeling and of mysticism resting on the Gospel of St. John. He exalted the importance of this Gospel at the expense of the other books of Scripture, and was equally free in his treatment of the great facts and principles of Divine revelation. Bretschneider, who was superintendent at Gotha, was a man of a totally different stamp. He was pre-eminently calm and logical—a man of common sense and of hard fact. To such a man the system of Schleiermacher must have appeared as baseless, as altogether hanging in the air. Whether the attitude of opposition which he assumed may have influenced him in his attack upon St. John, it is impossible to say. At all events, he came forward to challenge the genuineness of the Gospel.

We cannot enter upon the nature of his arguments; a good account of them the reader will find in Archdeacon Watkins. There are just two points connected with Bretschneider which we wish to signalize. The first is that from the commencement he refused to commit himself to the opinion of the spuriousness of St. John. What he advanced against the Gospel he advanced merely as difficulties—difficulties which might, and which would probably, be overcome. He wished to call attention to the subject, and to draw out the solid grounds on which the genuineness of the Gospel rested. His book was entitled, *Probabilities concerning the Nature and Origin of the Gospel and Epistles of the Apostle John*; and his attitude is sufficiently expressed in the following words from the preface:—

‘But we ask you, kind reader, to believe that whatever conclusions we have come to, we do not regard them as the utterances of an oracle, but as things which seem probable after discussion. It is

not that, in our opinion, the Gospel of St. John *is* spurious, but only that it *seems* to be so; though we should have preferred to write *is* more frequently instead of, for the thousandth time, repeating *seems*. For we expect, nay we hope, that the result will be that experts in criticism will teach us better wherever we may have made mistakes, and we will accept their corrections most willingly.¹

And yet, notwithstanding this most modest estimate of his own judgment, his treatment of St. John was really harsh in the extreme. His book is a small one compared with the volumes that have subsequently been written; and yet it contains almost everything material to the question. All the most difficult points as against St. John were advanced by him; and, as our author remarks, there are few arguments of any value in subsequent writers the germs of which may not be found in him.

The second point we wish to signalize is his retraction. The book, as might be expected, raised a perfect storm in the theological world, and the replies were numerous. Some of them were exceedingly passionate and bitter, but this did not disturb his equanimity. He diligently read and studied them, and then, after two years, being convinced that his arguments had been fully answered, he, in the most explicit manner, withdrew his conclusions. This retraction he repeated two years later; and still later he declared that he regarded the question as settled for the theological public. Such a retraction is certainly a phenomenon quite unique in theological history, and surely it carries with it a deep meaning. There is no reason to doubt the candour and good faith of Bretschneider; and what is remarkable is that an acute intellect such as he possessed, which at first was oppressed with the weight of difficulties, should, after full study of the subject, have come round to accept the genuineness of the Gospel.

The incident of Bretschneider, however, was merely a preliminary skirmish, and quite unconnected with that which was to follow. The real battle began in 1845, when Strauss published his *Leben Jesu*. It was almost immediately after that Baur stepped to the front; and since that time he and the Tübingen school, which he founded, have been the great adversaries against whom the orthodox theologian has had to contend. And in passing on to consider them it is well to notice the entire change in the character of the contest which took place. In Bretschneider's *Probabilia* we have the work of a theologian. It was the work of a man whose claim to be a Christian could not be disputed. It was written and

¹ Quoted by Watkins, p. 180.

published in a theological spirit, and with all the presuppositions of theology. In Strauss and Baur we have men of a very different stamp. The contest itself and the conditions of the contest are now completely changed. It is no longer a struggle between the tribes; it is an invasion of the Moabites. Christianity, viewed as a Divine revelation, had now to contend for its very existence; for it was the object of these new assailants to reduce the whole story of its origin to natural proportions. It would be folly to conceal from ourselves, from any feeling of politeness, what this really means. Natural and supernatural are convenient words. They sufficiently indicate a position, without connoting all that belongs to that position. But, if we do not use the plain speaking of a former age, we must not close our eyes to the gravity of the issue that was now raised.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the shock to the religious consciousness of Europe that was occasioned by the publication of Strauss's book. No words can paint the distress of religious minds in witnessing the cold-bloodedness with which the holiest events and personages were submitted to the dissecting-knife, and remorselessly hewn in pieces. Nor was this feeling confined to theological circles, which alone properly understood the matter. It extended far down among the people. We see this from the attitude of the people of Zürich, when at a subsequent period Strauss was appointed to the chair of Christian dogmatics and ethics in that city. The people rose in a body against it, and chased the Government which had appointed him from office. *Strauss soll und darf nicht kommen* was the unanimous cry. It would be impossible to summarize the arguments advanced by Strauss; because, from the nature of his work, he dealt almost exclusively with details. Some of the difficulties advanced by him were grave, and required the best attention of theologians, some of them were of a different character, while many could be regarded as nothing else but cavils. They have already been answered in detail by the many able theologians who have followed him, and they need not now engage our attention. But there are two general considerations connected with Strauss on which a few remarks may be permitted us.

The first has reference to his theory viewed as a whole. The idea under which he attacked the Gospels was that Christ's life was not, and could not be, such as it was depicted in them. Christ neither worked miracles, nor rose from the dead, as they declared He did. The Gospels are therefore spurious; they cannot be, as they profess to be, the work of

eye-witnesses.¹ Still they exist, and have existed for a long time, and how are we to account for their existence? He supposes that the Apostles and first disciples, in some mysterious and unexplained way, without miracle worked by Him, or His rising from the dead, came to believe in Christ as the Messiah. In consequence of this, their faith, they studied in the Old Testament all that was said about the Messiah. They saw there that He was expected to work miracles, and to do other wonderful things. It was clear, therefore, to them that all this must have been done by Jesus; for He was undoubtedly the Messiah. They, therefore, began very soon to attribute these things to Him. And the supernatural story once begun, swelled, as time went on, by accretion. There was a gradual growth of myth and legend around the person of the Saviour, till at length, some time in the second century, the story took the shape it possesses in our Gospels.

It is not necessary to criticize this theory; for it is already numbered among the things that are past. All we need do is to call attention to the great inconsequence that underlies it. If Christ did not work miracles, and did not rise from the dead, how did the first Christians come to believe that He did so? That they did so believe, and that their faith possessed an especially strong and undoubting character, we know from sources quite independent of our Gospels. It is clearly revealed from St. Paul's Epistles—that is, from documents which are acknowledged by all, and which belong to the very earliest period of Christianity. To this question Strauss has no answer to give which could for a moment be accepted. But the point to which we wish to call attention is the impossibility of the substance of the theory in view of all that we now know of the first and second centuries. It is but fair to say that at the time Strauss wrote, our knowledge of these primitive times was almost a blank. And hence the period from the Apostles till the end of the second century could be filled up by fancy events of almost any description. But now, gradually, through the progress of discussion, and from fresh discoveries, the main events of these times have emerged into light; and the consequence is that there is no place for theories like that of Strauss. We now know a great deal

¹ Strauss allowed, in the frankest manner, that miracle cannot be eliminated from the life of Jesus, if our Gospels are allowed to be genuine documents, the work of eye-witnesses. 'Sind die Evangelien wirklich geschichtliche Urkunden, so ist das Wunder aus der Lebensgeschichte Jesu nicht zu entfernen.' *Leben Jesu*, p. 17. See Dr. Salmon, *Introduction*, p. 11.

about
to t
grad
tion

theo
ceiv
Gos
bear
Still
the
he a
to b
ough
of e
atten
the d

'N
time,
third
new e
of the
them
auth
the pe
Gospe
collid
ment
seem
gradua
do as
is, sac
man to
of New
only th
this do

Th
to not
under
him:—

'Str
judice,
Left.
which t
manifes

about the first Christians, and the attitude in which they stood to their Gospels and other Scriptures; and the idea of Gospels gradually growing up by accretion of myths and other inventions is seen to be impossible and absurd.

There is another point, also, in regard to Strauss's general theory which deserves to be noted, and that is his inconceivable uncertainty and vacillation in regard to St. John's Gospel. To us this fact is especially welcome, because it bears witness to the candour and genuineness of his mind. Still, it is none the less inconceivable. For if we only look at the main elements of his theory, and the consequences which he admits will follow if only one of our Gospels is admitted to be genuine, we see that if there was one point on which he ought to have felt absolutely certain, it was the spuriousness of every one of our Gospels. Archdeacon Watkins calls attention to the point, and in order to do no injustice quotes the description of it given by Baur in the following terms:—

'Nothing is more indicative of the position of criticism at that time, than the confession which Strauss makes in the preface to the third edition of his *Life of Jesus*. The alterations which occur in this new edition all depend more or less on the fact that a renewed study of the Fourth Gospel had made his earlier doubts of this Gospel themselves in their turn doubtful. Not that he was convinced of its authenticity, but that he was no longer convinced of the contrary. In the peculiar position of the characteristics of this most remarkable Gospel, trustworthy and incredible, likely and unlikely, crossing and colliding with each other, he brought forwards in the first development of his work, with polemical zeal, just the adverse side which it seemed to him had been neglected. Since then the other side has gradually received its due from him, but he was not in a position to do as almost all other living theologians, even to De Wette, did—that is, sacrifice at once the opposite considerations. Is it possible for a man to be more wavering and uncertain on one of the chief problems of New Testament criticism? And yet even this utterance is made only that in the next edition of the *Life of Jesus* he might withdraw this doubting of his own doubt.'¹

The other point in connexion with Strauss which we wish to notice is the pre-supposition, pre-conception, or prejudice under which he wrote. Archdeacon Watkins remarks of him:—

'Strauss honestly believed himself to be absolutely free from prejudice, but he was bound hand and foot by the dogmas of the Hegelian *Left*. The individual is nothing; and therefore historical records which treat of the individual are of no authority. The Infinite cannot manifest itself in the finite, and therefore the Incarnation as told in the

¹ Quoted by Watkins, p. 198.

Gospels is impossible. Humanity is the true incarnation of God, the child of a known mother—Nature; of an unknown father—Spirit. The immanence of God is absolute, and miracle is therefore impossible. The legends of the Old Testament, which grew round the Messianic idea, were mythically applied to the person of the historic Jesus. The Church portrayed, not the Jesus whom Apostles saw, but the Christ which myth unconsciously created.¹

We have thus raised the question of these prepossessions, and of prepossession generally in so far as it bears on Gospel criticism. What effect must these views have had in determining *à priori* the result arrived at? What is the effect of prepossession generally? And how are we to view the prepossessions of orthodox writers?

It is to be observed that the idea of the living God and His providential government of the world lies at the root of Divine revelation, for if there is no living God to reveal Himself, there certainly cannot be a Divine revelation. It is also to be observed that the same idea of a living God revealing Himself lies at the root of all the Gospel narratives. At the root, we say, for this idea is not a mere idea held by the Gospel writers. It enters into the very substance and composition of the events narrated, and that to such an extent and to such a degree that Gospel events are wholly falsified if the existence of the living God and His Providence is denied. Nor is this all. The same idea of the living God and His Providence lies at the root of every movement of the religious life, and this again to such an extent that every such movement is wholly falsified if the living God is denied. Surely this is quite clear. Take, for instance, prayer, or religious obedience, or heavenly aspirations and longings. Why should we pray if there is no one to hear? Why should we obey if there is no master to command? Why should our hearts go upwards if there is no living One with whom to commune? It is in consequence of these facts which are unquestionable, that the idea of a living God and His providential government of the world is generally regarded as the fundamental postulate of Christian theology, just as the necessary character of natural laws is the fundamental principle of science. Christian theology cannot exist unless this principle is conceded, just as science cannot exist unless the necessary character of natural laws is conceded.

Now let us look at the prepossessions with which Strauss began his criticism in order to see what may be their bearing on what has been said. Strauss was a member of the

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 196.

Hegelian Left, and it is quite clear that so far as Christian theology is concerned, his views in that capacity differed in nothing from Atheism. We do not make this remark with any idea of calling names, or with any wish to identify Hegelianism with Atheism. We do it simply to point out a fact which is quite unquestionable. Atheism bluntly, and without circumlocution, denies the existence of the living God; Hegelianism does it as effectually, but with more ceremony and politeness. The affirmation of Atheism is, that nothing exists except matter and its laws; the affirmation of Hegelianism is that nothing exists except thought and its processes. It is clear, therefore, that neither system leaves any place for the idea of a living God. Now what must be the effect of such a presupposition on the criticism of the Gospel history? It is seen that it renders all real criticism quite impossible. And for this reason; that all the facts and principles which concurred in the origin of Christianity are falsified from the beginning. The question is no longer how to investigate these facts, to study their nature, and the evidence on which they rest. The question is simply how to discredit and get rid of them in the easiest way.

But there are other critics who, without committing themselves to any definite views in regard to God or His existence, content themselves with simply denying the existence or the possibility of miracles. In regard to these last we wish to point out that practically it makes no difference; for to deny miracles is in effect to deny the living God and His Providence. What is a miracle? If we reflect upon the matter we shall see that a miracle cannot in principle be separated from the ordinary Providence of God in human affairs or from His purpose in nature. The whole, in fact, forms one grand system, from the greatest of the miracles of Christ down to the formation of a blade of grass. You cannot break in upon this system at any point without subverting the whole. To deny the possibility of miracles is in effect to deny the whole system of Divine agency. You thereby assume a philosophical position from which the Divine action, whether in nature or in human affairs, is rendered incredible. And this carries with it, whether we are aware of it or not, the negation of the living God. We wish, in a few remarks, to make this plain.

If we allow that there is a living God, and that He governs in human affairs or in nature, what will be the mark or token by which we distinguish His action? It will be purpose. For an intelligent being, if he acts at all, must act by way of purpose. The actions of intelligent beings are, in point of fact,

distinguished from the blind and necessary effects of natural laws by the purpose which is impressed upon them. We do not think that anyone will question this. If he does so, we would refer him to human action, which, like the Divine, is also intelligent. If we look at the industries and other works of man we see that they are throughout marked by purpose. We may therefore set it down as quite certain that the whole system of Divine agency is one, and that, being intelligent agency, it is distinguished by the mark of purpose. A miracle is an intelligent and purposed act, and this makes it impossible to distinguish it from a providential act which is also purposed, or from God's agency in nature which is also purposed. We repeat it, the whole system from one end to the other is one and indivisible. Its elements are summed up in this simple saying. The living God is an intelligent being; if He acts in human affairs or in nature, He must act intelligently, and the mark or token by which we trace His footsteps is purpose.

Hence, running throughout the whole of nature we see two great principles. On the one hand there is Divine purpose, and on the other natural law. It is true that the existence of Divine action or purpose in nature some thirty or forty years ago was strenuously denied by a certain class of scientific men and others. They maintained that in nature natural laws reign alone, and that there is no place for Divine purpose. They even maintained that there is a contrariety or incompatibility between the two, and that if the one is admitted the other is necessarily excluded; so that if a man believed in natural law he was bound to disbelieve in Divine purpose. There was some excuse for this attitude of opposition in the fact that at that time the Divine action was generally presented under the crude conception of interpositions—that is, interferences with natural law. But suppose we substitute for that conception the far higher and grander one of immanent and never-ceasing purpose in nature, and we see that the supposed contrariety of the two principles vanishes. In human action no such contrariety is felt. Man does not feel that natural laws are any obstacle in the way of accomplishing his purpose. On the contrary, they are the very means by which he is enabled to attain his ends. In human products natural law and purpose are the complement of each other. Why should it be different in the case of God's government of nature? It is true, indeed, that the theory of evolution when first propounded was regarded as an implement by which Divine purpose was to be finally banished

from n
cleare
and nev
ever ha
high?
from on

But
of purp
principl
impress
belongs
miracles
altogeth
miracles
or forty
in takin
providen
may int
If there
nature;
is, mirac

Wha
His Pro
as the n
principle
intellige
has no
the relig
connecte
ment of
takes up
more or
document

But
mental p
different
consider
For the
living G
that He
to enter
be well
and not
especiall
culminat

from nature. But the more that theory is looked at, the clearer it is seen to be unthinkable, apart from the immanent and never-ceasing purpose of the Creator. How could nature ever have attained to cosmos if it had no guidance from on high? And is not Divine purpose written on the cosmos from one end to the other?

But now observe: If we admit in this sense the existence of purpose in nature, we have in effect admitted the whole principle of miracles. For the act by which that purpose is impressed upon nature is the act of an intelligent Being. It belongs in principle to the same category of action as do the miracles of Christ. In truth those critics who with vague or altogether unformed notions of God have decided against miracles—have really gone back to the worst errors of thirty or forty years ago. But the point we have to observe is, that in taking away miracles they take away in principle every providential act; that is, in other words, however little they may intend it they take away the very idea of a living God. If there is a living God He must act upon man and upon nature; but if He acts at all He must act intelligently, that is, miraculously.

What we maintain is, that the idea of the living God and His Providence is the fundamental principle of theology, just as the necessary character of natural laws is the fundamental principle of science. Hence, we submit that a man whose intelligence breaks down in presence of this great principle has no standing-ground within the sphere of theology or of the religious life. And plainly for this reason, that every fact connected with the origin of Christianity, and every movement of the religious life, is already falsified by the attitude he takes up. There is really no interest in following the process, more or less ingenious, by which he gets rid of the facts and documents which lie before him.

But it may be said, a man who sets out with the fundamental principle of theology is just as prejudiced, though in a different direction, as the man who does not. But a deeper consideration will show that this is by no means the case. For there is an immense difference between believing in a living God and His rule over all things, and the further fact that He has vouchsafed to condescend to reveal Himself and to enter into relations with us His creatures. A man might be well assured of the former fact, and yet might hesitate and not know what to say in presence of the latter. More especially will this be the case if Revelation is seen to culminate in the Incarnation. It would not, indeed, follow

that this hesitation was based on a recoil. It might just as likely rest upon the opposite feeling. The whole story of Revelation might be viewed as beautiful and desirable, and yet as a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded on no sure warranty of fact. The attitude of such a critic might be the exact counterpart of St. Thomas. He might say with St. Thomas: 'Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe.'

It is criticism in this spirit that the educated and thoughtful public are craving after. Thoughtful men see clearly that, should Christianity be parted with, there is really nothing to take its place. There is no other rock on which the moral and spiritual life of mankind could be anchored, so as to maintain a healthy development. And they shudder to think of the consequences, social and political, that might ensue if religious restraint were removed. But they are not willing to part with Christianity, at least till they understand better what it is and what it means. They desire to have the facts connected with its origin put before them in a fair and candid spirit. They want those facts to be sifted, they want to understand their objective value, and the light in which they appeared to the beholders. They want to know the rational ground, or, if it be so, want of rational ground, on which the Apostles and first Christians believed in Christ and devoted themselves to His service. Criticism of this kind would be esteemed as an immense boon; as for the criticism of a Strauss or a Renan, there is no help in that.

From the consideration of Strauss the Archdeacon passes on to Baur. Baur came forward so speedily in the wake of Strauss that it almost seems as if he used the latter by way of pioneer. At any rate Strauss broke the ice, and bore upon his shoulders all the weight of indignation arising out of the shock to Christian feeling. Room was thus made for Baur to come forward with his views and to claim a hearing. He was by far the greatest and most formidable of negative critics. And this arose not so much from what he accomplished in the sphere of criticism, though that was very great. It arose rather from his commanding intellect. He was able to put forward, in opposition to the traditional view, a compact and well-reasoned scheme, which accounted for the origin of Christianity on natural principles. And what was more, he gathered around him a whole school of brilliant writers who looked up to him as their master, and worked out his scheme. From the very outset his views took

a pow
and lo
It is
Baur's
throug
hopel
is at a
the de
vinced
contin
who t
his lab

It
account
format
few re
based
tween
St. Pe
or pill
so dee
Paul w
in pro
favour
The p
nating
the en
The st
deacon

'Th
'Th
A.D. 70.
Corinth
being g
tainly th
tainty i
'Th
ments a
the Jew
Gospel
Epistles
this per
rating t
upon th
anxious
Ephesia

a powerful hold of the intelligence and imagination of Europe; and for a time the opposite school were perplexed by them. It is very different, however, now. At the present moment Baur's theory, as a theory, has been pierced through and through in every direction, and it now lies before us as a hopeless ruin. And yet it cannot be said that his influence is at an end. There are many critics who, without adopting the details of his theory, still being on *à priori* grounds convinced that some theory to the same effect must be true, continue to work in the same direction: while popular writers who take their views at second-hand, continue to appeal to his labours as 'the latest results of criticism.'

It would be impossible in our brief limits to give an account of the system of Baur. Those who desire such information we would refer to the pages of our author. Yet a few remarks we may be permitted to make. His theory was based on the idea that there existed a bitter opposition between the followers or party of St. Paul, and the party of St. Peter, which latter party embraced nearly all the original or pillar Apostles. The opposition is supposed to have been so deep and so embittered, that the Petrine party pelted St. Paul with the nicknames of Balaam and Simon Magus. Yet in process of time there was a reaction, so we are told, in favour of St. Paul, or at least in favour of a higher unity. The parties gradually drew together, minimizing and eliminating their differences, till at length they coalesced, towards the end of the second century, in one united Catholic Church. The stages of this movement are thus summarized by Archdeacon Watkins:—

'There are three stages of the development:

'The first period extends to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The documents are, the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Romans—these four, and only these four, being genuine Pauline Epistles—and the Apocalypse, which is certainly the work of John, and represents an original Ebionite Christianity in opposition to Paulinism.

'The second period extends from A.D. 70 to 140. The documents are, first the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which belong to the Jewish wars under Hadrian, then the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospel of Mark, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the pseudo-Pauline Epistles, and finally the Catholic Epistles. The characteristics of this period are the first endeavours on both sides towards moderating the antagonism. The Jewish Christians no longer insisted upon the requirements of circumcision. The Pauline party were anxious to heal the breach, and hence sprung the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

'The third period extends from A.D. 140. The extremes of the Ebionites on the one hand, and of the Gnostics on the other, were now abandoned. This is marked in practice by the Roman Church and the watchword "Peter and Paul," and in idea by the fourth Gospel. The documents of this period are the Pastoral Epistles, and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles.

'The Johannine Gospel is represented as being most clearly of all the result of a second century purpose. On both the great questions of theological discussion which troubled the Church in the second century, Gnosticism and the Paschal controversy, it is an obvious rewriting of the original evangelical tradition from a point of view which represents in time A.D. 160 or 170, and in place Asia Minor, or more probably Alexandria. The authenticity of the Gospel is, indeed, for Baur not the main question. The tendency and the character of the writing are essential to his position.'

If we look at this theory we see at a glance the ingenuity with which the miraculous origin of Christianity is set aside. The high views of the Person of Christ, which in the end prevailed, were originated by St. Paul, who was not an eye-witness; and they were originated much to the distress of the original Apostles, who were eye-witnesses. Having been thus introduced they gradually won their way, chiefly through the energy of St. Paul and the enthusiasm of his followers. The natural result would be that these views would gradually create, on very slender foundations, the whole miraculous history of the Gospels. It took about a hundred years after the Crucifixion before this miraculous history was finally fixed in our own present synoptic Gospels; and thirty more before the final touch was given in the Gospel of St. John. But how does all this stand the test of fact?

It is clear that it can only establish itself by a wholesale falsification of almost every document of primitive Christianity which is of any value. The four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, nine Epistles of St. Paul, the Epistles of St. John and St. Peter are all forgeries, and forgeries of especial wickedness. For they are specially concocted, not to tell the truth, but only that which the writers desired might be believed. And there is this also to be observed. They are not, like other forgeries, the work of obscure individuals, who perhaps hardly expected that anyone would be deceived. These forgeries, if we accept the views of Baur and his followers, are the deliberate work of the most prominent leaders of the Christian community, and their general acceptance supposes an extensive conspiracy against the

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 233.

truth a
intense
view is
propor
viewed
moral
in the
great l
a Theo
are we
forth t
proces
undoul
of hea
theory
which
be a
apocry
ment, o
they a
forgerie

It v
by whi
cannot
which v
attentio
embitte
practic
religiou
instanc
in the c
tent to
higher
became
emphas
but rat
embitte
years'
has cal
than ev
been a
Christi
leave a
we look
collapse

truth all throughout the Christian body. There is something intensely shocking in the cold-bloodedness with which this view is propounded ; and the only excuse is that probably its propounders were too deeply engrossed with their subject, viewed as an intellectual exercise, to have time to look at the moral aspects of the question. Yet these aspects are serious in the extreme. What is to be thought of Christianity if its great leaders in the second century—an Ignatius, a Polycarp, a Theophilus—were engaged in such a conspiracy? Or how are we to look at Christianity if, in the shape in which it went forth to conquer the world, it was the result of such a hideous process? How, in that case, could it really have brought, as undoubtedly it has brought, healing and brightness to millions of hearts? It is all very well, in defence of this forgery theory, to point to the multitude of pseudonymous writings which originated in the second century. But the critic must be a poor judge who could put in the same class with apocryphal Gospels and Acts the writings of the New Testament, or the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, for they also are, by the Tübingen school, pronounced to be forgeries.

It would be an interesting task to trace the whole process by which the Tübingen theory was overthrown ; but this we cannot attempt. There are, however, three observations which we may be permitted to make. Dr. Salmon has called attention to the improbability that any such reconciliation of embittered parties, as is supposed, could have taken place in practice. In point of fact we do not find in the case of religious divisions that they are so easily healed. Take, for instance, the case of Luther and the Pope. We do not find, in the case of this quarrel, that either of the parties were content to sublimate themselves in order to come together in a higher unity. On the contrary, as time went on the division became only more defined, and the points of difference emphasized. Nor was there any tendency to reconciliation, but rather the contrary. The parties got more and more embittered, till in process of time the quarrel led to a thirty years' war ; and even at the present moment, though feeling has calmed down, both sides are as far, if not farther, apart than ever. Of one thing we may be very sure. If there had been a division such as that described by Baur in primitive Christianity, it could not have been healed up so as not to leave a trace behind. Another thing to be noted is this. If we look at the Tübingen theory we see that it necessarily collapses if one or more of the books supposed to be spurious

are found to be genuine, or even if they are thrust back from the dates assigned to them. Now this is just what has actually occurred. In the process of discussion there has been a general tendency in dates to recede. The Synoptical Gospels have been carried back far beyond the second century; and, indeed, such an amount of argument in their favour has been accumulated by defenders of their genuineness as cannot well be refused. But the most signal instance is the Gospel of St. John. It is the keystone of the Tübingen theory, and was put by Baur as late as A.D. 160. The date is, in fact, necessary to the theory; but, in view of our present knowledge, it is simply absurd. St. John's Gospel has been going back farther and farther, and at the present moment it can be traced up to the very time of the Apostle.

But, as an element in the refutation of the Tübingen theory, perhaps the most significant thing has been the labours of Bishop Lightfoot. It is no small testimony to his acuteness that he from an early period saw that the key of the whole position lay in the epistles of Clement, of Ignatius, and of Polycarp; and he devoted a great part of his life to the vindication of these precious documents. By so doing he ran his keen sword through the very heart of the theory. It is clear, if there existed that embittered opposition between the supposed Pauline and Petrine parties which Baur has described, there would necessarily be some trace of it in the epistles of Clement, of Ignatius, and of Polycarp; for by the supposition the division penetrated through the Church from one end to the other. Especially must this have been so in the case of Clement. It is quite possible that, as a young man, he witnessed the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. At any rate, he wrote not very long after the event. And what do we find? We find that both Apostles are equally venerated by him; that he has not the smallest consciousness of any difference between them, and that he writes to the Corinthians in the fullest confidence that their views on this matter are exactly the same as his own. It is precisely the same with Ignatius and Polycarp, who come later in succession. Both St. Peter and St. Paul are equally venerated by both.

In the concluding portion of the lecture Dr. Watkins goes on to consider the other opponents of St. John's Gospel. He divides them into two classes, viz. the advocates of partition theories and the purely negative school. In the former class we have, amongst other names, those of Paulus, Weisse, Schenkel, Ewald, Hase, Reuss, Renan, and Weizsäcker. In the latter category are put Keim, the two Holtzmanns, Hönig,

Thom
of *Sup*
son.
stood,
genera
In
denyin
of bein
the ca
is abu
critics
by tak
their v
Weisse
the dis
the his
He ac
credits
Jourde
that a
opinio
instan
beginn
What
as som
amanu
a discipl
or that
It wor
to such
what i
Bu
study
contro
in sac
Matth
rations
not.
views
of prim
way.
deep f
and of
regard
inspire

Thoma, Scholten; and of English writers Tayler, the author of *Supernatural Religion*, Dr. E. A. Abbott, and Dr. S. Davidson. His accounts of these writers, as will readily be understood, are by no means full; but he gives a sketch of them generally, and indicates the results at which they arrived.

In regard to the advocates of partition theories, without denying in general that a book may bear on it the clear marks of being of a composite character, we think that this is not the case with St. John's Gospel. And that this is really so is abundantly proved by the discordant results at which the critics have arrived—a point which the Archdeacon signalizes by taking as his text Mark xiv. 50: 'And not, even so, did their witness agree together.' In the above list, for instance, Weiss and most of those who follow are inclined to accept the discourses of the Gospel as Johannine; but they discredit the history, as by a later hand. Renan does just the opposite. He accepts the history as Johannine and trustworthy, but discredits the discourses. To him they are *tirades prétentieuses, lourdes, mal-écrites*. Then there is the further phenomenon that a critic puts forth an opinion; then he doubts of his opinion; and finally he doubts of his doubt. Witness, for instance, the changes of Renan. It is all guesswork from beginning to end, and people are beginning to weary of this. What we crave for is fact—real hard fact. It may be the case, as some of these writers assure us, that St. John used an amanuensis, or that the Gospel was composed from notes by a disciple, and afterwards obtained the sanction of the apostle, or that it was put forth by disciples without that sanction. It would be interesting if we really had any information as to such details. But we have not; and, such being the case, what is the use of romancing about it?

But, if we mistake not, the whole tendency of present study is against these ideas. At the commencement of the controversy, and especially in Germany, the idea of alterations in sacred books was carried to an extreme. We had Ur-Matthæus, Ur-Marcus, present Matthew, present Mark, alterations, fresh recensions, accretions, interpolations, and what not. And it was possible at that time to put forward such views from the fact of general ignorance as to the real views of primitive Christians. But gradually that ignorance is giving way. We now know very much of the strong convictions and deep feelings of the circle which gathered round the apostles, and of the age immediately succeeding. We know how they regarded their Scriptures. We know that they believed them inspired. We know the ground on which this belief rested,

viz. that they were the work of Apostles or could be traced back to Apostles. In point of fact no writing permanently held its place which could not in this way be guaranteed. Apostles in their view were *πνευματοφόροι*, specially commissioned by Christ to be His witnesses and gifted with the Spirit for that purpose. Apostles alone could deliver a Gospel. In our view the position in which St. Luke found himself was simply this. There were in existence many detached narratives of Gospel history, drawn up by Apostles (possibly with consultation) for reading in church; and it had been felt as a desideratum that these narratives should be arranged consecutively, so as to form a connected history. Many had taken in hand to do this; and St. Luke felt that he had exceptional advantages for accomplishing the task. But his Gospel could never have been accepted had it not had distinct apostolic sanction—a fact which is attested by early tradition. Then if we consider that all these books were read in church, and that all were familiar with their contents, it is seen how impossible it is to suppose such wholesale manipulations of sacred writings as critics suppose. And especially in regard to St. John's Gospel. It never could have attained its position had it not been clear to everyone that it was the work of the Apostle.

But the system of guesswork is seen most fully in those whom the Archdeacon classes as negative critics. He has devoted considerable space to Dr. S. Davidson and his somewhat remarkable change of view; and he puts side by side the two latest critics and the discordant results at which they arrive. Then we have the following summary of the result of his enquiry:—

‘But the time has now arrived when this division of our subject must be brought to a conclusion. I have endeavoured in the three lectures of the Lent term to set before you “the judgment of centuries” upon the Fourth Gospel, and have in the four lectures of this term tried to examine the criticism of “our age.” . . . And now what does it all prove? Where is this destructive criticism, which is, by a definite and compact body of measured proof, to establish the fact that the convictions of all previous ages are a series of mistakes, and that “our age” has cancelled the judgment of centuries? Evanson, Bretschneider, Strauss, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Renan, Scholten, Keim, Davidson, and the rest—where is their collective wisdom, where the fixed results of their investigations? By what laws of evidence is a case to be supported in which almost every witness contradicts the witness on his own side who has gone before, and then contradicts himself? What is the value of that man's evidence who tells us plainly, first, that he is certain, then that he is doubtful,

then th
may ye
assure
now th
sical, r
posite,
trustw
but no
that he
an Ale
Philo,
depend
equal
140, 1
‘If
cancel
deliber
with th
the eff
and is

W
accoun
in Ge
mache
list o
Bisho
day.
which
as bea
lent b
be de
conne

ART

NEAR
nine l
Angli
lectur

then that he is doubtful about his doubts—but thinks his opinion may yet change? What verification is possible for theories which assure us now that the Gospel is the growth of unconscious myth, now the result of deliberate design; now that its roots are metaphysical, now that they are mystical; now that the work is clearly composite, now that it is absolutely one; now that the discourses are trustworthy but not the history; now that the history is trustworthy but not the discourses; now that the author is clearly a Jew, now that he is certainly a Greek; now that he is a Syrian, now that he is an Alexandrian; now that the whole teaching bears the impress of Philo, now that it is permeated by the Gnosticism of Basilides? What dependence can be placed upon investigations which assure us with equal confidence that the Gospel was written A.D. 180, 170, 160, 150, 140, 120, 110, or even far back into the first century?

‘If all these clashing, contradicting, self-destroying, each-other-cancelling theories of “our age” are now placed beside the calm and deliberate judgment of the second and all succeeding centuries, and with the positive judgment and knowledge of our own day, what is the effect? Is it less than to divide positive unity by a positive zero, and is not the result a positive infinity?’¹

We cannot follow the Archdeacon through the long account which he has given of writers on the other side, both in Germany and in England. Beginning with Schleiermacher, Neander, and De Wette, he passes in review a long list of writers, and winds up with our English scholars—Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, Dr. Salmon, and Dr. Sanday. Neither can we take account of the seventh lecture, which deals with the important subject of recent discoveries as bearing on St. John’s Gospel. We take leave of this excellent book in the hope that it may have the effect, so much to be desired, of bringing home to men’s minds the real facts connected with this difficult yet most important subject.

ART. IX.—CHURCH AND STATE UNDER THE TUDORS.

Church and State under the Tudors.

By GILBERT W. CHILD. (London, 1890.)

NEARLY half a century has elapsed since the publication of nine lectures by the Rev. P. Cooper under the title of *The Anglican Church the Creature and Slave of the State*. The lectures were written from a Roman point of view by an

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, p. 409.

Irish priest of that communion, and the author made considerable use of the arbitrary mode of enforcing what was considered to be the doctrine of the royal supremacy in illustrating his subject.

Of course we had in due order the account of the 'Submission of the Clergy' in 1531 to declare the king 'the head of the Church so far as the law of Christ would allow,' followed by the Act of 1534, entitled 'an Act for the Submission of the Clergy to the King's Majesty,' also the Act of Uniformity of the first year of the reign of Elizabeth, and the Act of the same year to restore to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and the Act of the eighth year, which professed to give the Queen's dispensation of all difficulties as regards the election and the consecration of all bishops who had been made since the beginning of her reign.

The volume which we are now reviewing is issued with the modest title of *Church and State under the Tudors*, but might more appropriately have been styled, as Mr. Cooper's work was, *The Anglican Church the Creature and Slave of the State*, for to represent it as such appears to be the whole object of Mr. Child's publication. He does not, indeed, write from a Roman point of view, neither does he indulge in the sneers against Anglicanism or in the contemptuous tone which characterize that work, the author of which speaks of it as 'being a refutation of certain Puseyite claims advanced on behalf of the Established Church.' And indeed there is nothing to show from what point of view Mr. Child does write; neither are we able to describe him from anything that appears in this volume as a Churchman or a Nonconformist. He professes to write from the unprejudiced view of one who has studied both old and recent works on English Church history, and to hold the balance between the two accounts, of which he says, and we think without much exaggeration, that 'the change of view in the new as compared with the older books is often so great that it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that in the popular delineations of the subject the lights and shadows seem almost to have changed places within the memory of living men' (p. vi). But though he professes to write with the utmost impartiality we see on his very first page what we are to expect in his adoption of the term 'the Reformation settlement;' and so we join issue with him at once on the ground that there is no such thing as a 'Reformation settlement,' the changes which began in the reign of Henry VIII., and were continued during the reign of

his su
again
things
reigns
ment
of no
any p

Th
formit
and th
worth

An
arbitra
cedent
heard
the p
shown
itself i
beth, i
unders
Engla
the cl
uniting
jurisdi
the sa
say, th
argum
unless
to the
fined
whole
the tim
Church
reign o

Ac
duction
elabora
from t
in mos
wards.
except
drawn
exagge
See, an
and Pr

his successor, reversed in the reign of Philip and Mary, and again adopted by Elizabeth, followed by the altered state of things which gradually came over the Church during the reigns of James I. and Charles I., culminating in the settlement that was made upon the return of Charles II., allowing of no period which can be fixed upon for such a term during any part of the time intervening between 1530 and 1660.

There was certainly a settlement when the Act of Uniformity was passed and the Prayer Book of 1662 was issued, and that settlement has remained with scarcely any change worth noticing to the present day.

And if this be so it will be to no purpose to quote any arbitrary acts of the preceding century as affording any precedent for the Church of this day. Mr. Child has undoubtedly heard of the sentiment implied in the words 'the recovery from the principles of the Reformation,' and, unless it can be shown that the royal supremacy must of necessity exhibit itself in the way in which it was exerted in the reign of Elizabeth, it cannot be argued that there is no proper use and understanding of the doctrine. And surely the Church of England has a right to plead that in the very Acts themselves the claim of supremacy is worded 'for the restoring and uniting to the Imperial Crown of this realm the ancient jurisdictions, authorities, superiorities, and pre-eminences to the same of right belonging or appertaining.' If, that is to say, the royal supremacy has been abused, that is no argument that it will always continue to be so abused. Yet unless this is so the whole argument of Mr. Child's book falls to the ground, for though his work is for the most part confined to historical facts, it is impossible not to see that his whole view of the case is that the Church of England, from the time of its separation from the rest of the Western Church, is quite a different thing from what it was in the reign of Henry VII.

Accordingly we are not surprised to find that the Introduction, which occupies the first two chapters, contains an elaborate attempt to represent the Church of this country, from the earliest period down to the reign of Henry VIII., in most marked contrast with its history from that time forwards. Neither have we any special fault to find with him except for the conclusion which he evidently means to be drawn from the facts which he narrates. If he has somewhat exaggerated the devotion of English Churchmen to the Holy See, and perhaps made little account of Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, he has, upon the whole, honestly represented

the true state of affairs, which we do not mean to gainsay—that the National Church was an obedient child of the Roman See. For the earliest known relations of Church and State the author is content to follow as his guide the Appendices by the present Bishop of Oxford, annexed to the *Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Constitution and Working of the Ecclesiastical Courts*. Quoting the Report itself (p. xviii), he speaks of the Norman Conquest as 'having placed the English Church in closer connexion with the Churches of the Continent, introduced a new school of ecclesiastical administrators, and coincided in time with a revival of the study of civil and canon law.' And here he makes a point towards the establishment of the contrast we have been speaking of, viz. that as the Western Church was, until the so-called Reformation, one and indivisible, and had an existence prior to that of the nations of modern Europe, the Church which is now spoken of as the National Church could in no intelligible sense be then called National. We do not care to quarrel with him about the term, nor, again, with his denial that it could properly be called the Church of England; only we demur to the distinction being pressed so far as to imply that the National Church of this day may not also be called the Church *in* England, there being no other body that so much as claims to have a succession of bishops who have held the sees all through the troublous times of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As for the rest of the two introductory chapters, the struggles between the popes and the kings, and the alternations of ascendancy of the royal and papal powers, are well and interestingly described.

The real business of the work begins with Chap. III., and consists of a tolerably fair and accurate description of the state of the Church during the reigns of Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, the latter reign having, as might be expected, the lion's share of the volume.

If we could abstract from the volume the *animus* which manifestly pervades the whole of it we should describe Mr. Child's work as a very useful and, upon the whole, fair account of the progress of things during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., as well as that of Elizabeth. The facts are carefully stated, and, we have no doubt, amply satisfy the writer as to the conclusion which he draws from them, viz. that the Church of this country as it existed prior to what is designated the Reformation settlement, and as it exists at the present day, are two entirely distinct bodies. We of course entirely demur to this conclusion, and are pre-

pared
is not
Henry
body
broken

Th
what v
but en
unavoi
ing to
cessful
appear
charac
charac
we can
divorce
astonis

'It
generati
question
merely
as a dec
one who
any cap

Nov
school
cause o
consider
the *Rea*
years a
subject
of Cath
proved
assertio
that H
about c
widow,
much a
It is too
the gen
upon th
entered
readers
ferences
coloured

VOL.

pared to maintain that if the Established Church of this day is not the same Church as was established in the reign of Henry VII. it is no Church at all, but only a schismatical body separated from the rest of the Western Church and broken off from the unity of the Church Catholic.

The author, however, does not confine his attention to what we consider to have been the main purpose of his writing, but enters into the history of the period, as indeed was almost unavoidable if the subject was to be made tolerably interesting to ordinary readers. And here he has not been so successful, for though he is at home with Acts of Parliament he appears to us to be extremely deficient in his estimate of character and appreciation of motives. There is not a single character of which he has attempted a description in which we can at all agree with him; and as to the history of the divorce, he is entirely at sea. Nothing in the book has so astonished us as the following passage:—

‘It will, I think, appear that the old belief, so much in fashion a generation ago, that many persons even now can hardly hear it questioned without a shock, that the divorce was taken in hand merely to gratify Henry’s caprice, and the scruples only put forward as a decent veil wherewith to cover it, must be abandoned by everyone who makes the slightest pretence to impartial judgment or to any capacity for weighing evidence’ (p. 61).

Now, not only do we profess to belong to that old-fashioned school who believe that the divorce was the one immediate cause of the separation from the Pope, but we avow that we consider it impossible for anyone who has attentively studied the *Records of the Reformation*, as published at Oxford some years ago, to take Mr. Child’s view of the matter. The whole subject, as treated by him, is full of mistakes. The virginity of Catharine when she was married to Henry is distinctly proved from the Simancas Records and her own reiterated assertion, and the whole correspondence of the period shows that Henry had from first to last no scruple of conscience about divorcing one woman, who was his brother’s virgin-widow, and then marrying another who in canon law had as much affinity to him as any brother’s wife could have had. It is too long a story to go into here, and as it does not affect the general subject of the supposed changes which followed upon the separation from the Pope, we should not have entered upon it if it were not that we wished to warn our readers against putting too implicit trust in Mr. Child’s inferences from historical facts, which, in this case at least, have coloured his representation of those facts.

VOL. XXXI.—NO. LXI.

L

We need not enter here into any account of the changes introduced in the latter part of the reign. The formularies of the Church and its services remained pretty much the same as ever, and the author need not have sheltered himself under the *ægis* of Archbishop Bramhall when he distinguishes the separation from Rome, which was completely effected in this reign, from the changes of doctrine effected by the councillors of Edward VI.

'The many Acts,' says the Archbishop, 'which were passed in the reign of Henry VIII. declaring the independence of the Church of England, were passed by Roman Catholics when there were no thoughts of any Reformation. If it was this separation from Rome which constituted a schism, then the authors of it—Heath and Bonner, Tunstall and Gardiner, Stokesley and Thirlby—were the schismatics. The separation was made to our hands. It was not till Edward's days that the Church of England embraced the doctrines of the Reformation' (p. 95).

Neither need we discuss the question how far the clergy, whether in Convocation or otherwise, were consulted in the ecclesiastical arrangements of the period. Mr. Child gives its full weight to the warning of the Bishop of Oxford at the commencement of Appendix IV. of the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*; yet upon the whole it must be admitted that the clergy were helpless tools in the hands of the King and his vicegerent Cromwell. We are not concerned to defend the proceedings of the King or of Parliament, whether it be in the appointment of Cromwell or his lay vicegerent taking precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any other equally flagrant breaches of ecclesiastical order, such as the appointment of bishops *durante beneplacito*. We need not defend any of the actions of either of the reigns of the Tudor dynasty, and if it be said that they were the immediate result of the separation from Rome it may be urged that they are not the necessary result, as is evident from the fact that no such attempts to tyrannize over the Church could be made in the present day. The author makes a great point of the ignoring of Convocation; but, if this is to be of any value in strengthening his argument for the entire alienation of the post-Reformation Church from that which existed in earlier times, he ought to have been able to show that in all subsequent changes Convocation was never consulted at all, as it was, for instance, in the establishment of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. in 1549. We are not careful to defend the proceedings of either Henry's reign or that of his son. Of course it must be admitted that all kinds of irregularities

occu
Eliza
deple
Chur

And
was i
testar
died
1552
stand
which
super
doctri

Sp
tion o
the a
Counc
elimin
Calvin
whose
probab
prefac
munio
be suff
though
an inte
extrem
ture de

Mr
advanc
during
of the
Polish
body c
tion, so
their m
change
modell
as thos
of curic
as stand
this day

occurred, not only in these reigns, but still more in that of Elizabeth. That many things occurred which we heartily deplore must be admitted. Of this transition state of the Church in England we can only say with the poet—

‘Pudet hæc opprobra nobis
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli.’

And we may, indeed, be thankful for the breakwater which was interposed and which stopped the flowing flood of Protestantism in the reign of Philip and Mary. Had not Edward died so opportunely as he did the second Prayer Book of 1552 would soon have been in common use as the authorized standard of doctrine for a few years, when that third Book, which is known to have been in contemplation, would have superseded it, and obliterated the few marks of Catholic doctrine still traceable in the second.

Speaking roughly, it may be said that the intended alteration of doctrine commenced with the reign of Edward, under the auspices of the Calvinist Duke of Somerset and the Council, out of which body the Catholic element had been eliminated, Cranmer himself, though not specially addicted to Calvinism, being a mere tool in the hands of the Protector, whose chief object probably was spoliation. It must in all probability have been Somerset who drew up the arrogant preface put into the mouth of Edward when the new Communion Service came out in 1548. That preface alone would be sufficient to show what is otherwise quite incontestable, though Churchmen have been slow to see it, that there was an intention from the very first to push things forward to an extreme which was not quite reached when Edward's premature death brought everything to an untimely end.

Mr. Child has rightly apprehended and described the advances of Protestantism, in the form of Zwinglianism, during the reign, but has entirely misrepresented the state of the case when he speaks of the charter granted to the Polish refugee John Alasco as the first legalization of any body of Nonconformists in England. Alasco's congregation, so far from being a body of Dissenters, afforded in their mode of worship a type according to which the coming changes in formularies and doctrine were intended to be modelled. He speaks of this and other similar bodies, such as those in the dioceses of Bath and Wells and of Norwich, as of curious and utterly anomalous bodies, as indeed they are, as standing in contrast with the Church and its ordinances of this day; but it is more than probable that the Polish noble-

man was conceded his special privilege for the express purpose both of remodelling the formularies and strengthening the position of the English Church by its show of unity with other Protestant communities. These bodies of foreigners, in spite of their Congregational proclivities, were in this reign affiliated to the Church of England, and this relation was renewed in the time of Elizabeth, when their privileges were restored to them; and in spite of their form of Church government the bishops of the diocese in which they were situated were their official superintendents, and under this relation in the succeeding reign of James I. they gave Laud, Wren, and other bishops considerable trouble. They did not like their existence, but did not know very well how to get rid of them. And we may here observe that though Cranmer has the credit of doing most of the work in the alteration of the formularies and the translation of the portions of the Breviary and Missal into the vernacular, yet Peter Martyr and Alasco had in all probability, after the death of Bucer, pretty much the management of affairs. Historians have neglected to notice that the second exhortation in the Communion Office is given almost verbatim from the works of Peter Martyr, and Alasco's account of his own service and its vindication are worth consulting in reference to this point. So completely identified were these Germans with the English Churchmen, in the view of Lutherans, that when they were driven out in the succeeding reign they were refused admittance to the towns professing Lutheranism on the common ground that they were 'the devil's martyrs.'

Of the reaction in Mary's reign, which Mr. Child despatches in a single chapter, we have little to say, though possibly something might be said as to the necessity of some of the severe measures adopted. Of course it is undeniable that the Smithfield fires have caused that ingrained and apparently ineradicable hatred of Popery which has ever since existed in the minds of Englishmen. But the chief result of the reign, so far as the religious life of England is concerned, consists in the fact that the Protestant divines who had flourished under Edward were driven into exile. But here we will let Mr. Child speak for himself, for he has seen, what few Church historians have been able to grasp, how absurd it is to suppose that the English Reformers of either reign had any predilection for the Lutheran theory.

'Another result of the persecution was that many of the Protestant divines who had flourished under Edward were driven into exile, and sought refuge, not among the Lutherans of North Germany, but

among
the up
and is
tender
develop
the ex
they m
pointe
tender
this te
affecte
and k
ments
a conc
in the
most
Marty
to enj
whom
notabl
their p
of the

And
it mus
for his
of this
blishm
do not
misrep
ment.
reign
of the
author
state o
govern

It
affect
that M
torian
that 9
formed
has so
numbe
but th
signed
best c

among the Zwinglian and Calvinist communities of Switzerland and the upper Rhine. This is a fact which has a double significance and is of much importance. It shows, in the first place, the strong tendency towards the Zwinglian form of Protestantism which had developed itself in the English Church during Edward's reign, for the exiles would naturally direct their steps towards those with whom they most strongly sympathized; and it accounts, as has been often pointed out, for the further development of the same or similar tendencies which took place in Elizabeth's reign. The strength of this tendency in the Swiss towns to which the exiles went naturally affected their minds, and, reinforced as it was by the cordiality and kindness with which they were mostly received, and the sentiments of gratitude and affection thus awakened in them, soon made a conquest of them altogether, and this form of Christianity became in their eyes the only one really worthy of the name. But while most of these men, filled with love and admiration of Bullinger, Martyr, and some other of the Swiss leaders of reform, were content to enjoy their friendship and imbibe their doctrines, a few others—of whom Whittingham (afterwards Dean of Durham) was the most notable—became enamoured of their discipline as well, and, bringing their passion for it also back to England with them, laid the foundation of the Puritan movement and of all its momentous results' (p. 174).

And now we come to the reign of Elizabeth. And here it must be admitted that Mr. Child can make out a good case for his theory, if only it could be made clear that all the horrors of this reign are the natural and necessary results of the establishment of the Royal Supremacy. The facts of the case do not admit of dispute, and we do not accuse the writer of misrepresentation. Only there is a missing link in the argument. If the normal state of ecclesiastical matters in the reign of Elizabeth is to be attributed wholly to the existence of the Royal Supremacy and the abolition of the Papal authority in this realm, how is it that so very different a state of affairs exists in this nineteenth century, under the government of another queen?

It is, perhaps, worth while to notice here that it does not affect the case we are considering one way or the other that Mr. Child has fallen into the mistake which every historian has made, and which perhaps originated with Camden, that 98 per cent. of the parochial clergy should have conformed. He attempts, indeed, to account for it, but perhaps has some misgiving as to the truth of the allegation. The numbers have been variously estimated from 180 to 192, but the very fact that such a definite number has been assigned shows that no calculation has been made, which at best could have been but on an average, but that certain

prominent individuals were fixed upon and their number counted. It is simply impossible, when only one bishop (and he a notorious scoundrel) should have been found ready to conform, and when so many heads of houses at Oxford and Cambridge refused to take the oath, as well as numerous members of cathedral chapters—that the inferior clergy should have been in such overwhelming numbers content to sacrifice their consciences in order to retain their preferments. It is admitted that more than half of those who declined to take the oath were dignitaries. The estimate is on the face of things absurd, but is absolutely disproved by the fact of the immense number of ordinations performed by Parker and Grindal and others during the first two years of the reign, and by the notorious fact that further on in the earlier years of Queen Elizabeth there were so many churches actually without service, and so many more served by persons without any pretensions to holy orders. Besides this it seems probable that in remote districts—as, for instance, in Wales—the old Latin service went on for a time as usual. There was at least no possibility in North Wales or in the Isle of Man for any new service to be performed, for it was many years before there was either Prayer Book or Bible printed in the vernacular of either district. It has, indeed, been till lately the fashion amongst English writers to boast of the numbers of the conforming clergy as tending towards the establishing of the continuity of the English Church. To us, if we could believe the fact, it would be amongst the most distressing features of the history of the Reformation. Looking at the present state and condition of the National Church, we need not be afraid to face the difficulties in which English Churchmen were placed three hundred years ago, and may thank God for the recovery from the principles of the Reformation.

And surely in this connexion we may be thankful for the interposition of Mary's reign between that of Edward and Elizabeth. It arrested the downward course of things and allowed for a fresh beginning. Even the adoption of the second book of Edward instead of the first, much as it might seem to have been to be regretted, was probably for the best. Had the first been chosen it would have been watered down to accommodate itself to the Protestant mind, whereas the changes introduced into the second, slight as they may seem to be, were accommodations tending towards the Catholic side and admitting of a development of which we have not yet witnessed the termination. There can be as little doubt that

the r
the a
conci
was
to M
ciliat
nor
woul
term
the r
Cath
padi
was
in th
his Z

W
which
in wh
which
he do
his th
the C
believ
were
sect
in th
little
thank
us to
repai
reme
it is n
of E
the g
Ponti
most
made
Chur
bisho
hope
Chur
to be
its ep
recogn
S

the reintroduction of the words of the First Prayer Book in the administration of the Holy Communion was intended to conciliate the Catholic party as their omission in the second was meant to deny the Real Presence in the Eucharist. As to Mr. Child's conjecture that there was any view of conciliating Lutherans, we can only say that there neither were nor ever had been any Lutherans in England whom it would have been worth while to attempt to conciliate. The term *Lutheran* was, undoubtedly, constantly employed in the reign of Henry to denote all who were opposed to Catholicism, but might have been fairly replaced by *Æcolampadian* or *Zwinglian*. Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester, certainly was considered a Lutheran, but that was because he believed in the Real Presence, and so was considered a black sheep by his Zwinglian and Calvinistic brethren of the hierarchy.

We cannot, of course, affect to wonder at the style in which Mr. Child dwells upon the arbitrary and tyrannical way in which Elizabeth carried everything before her. The facts which he details, and many more of a similar kind which he does not enumerate, make out an extremely good case for his theory that, owing to the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy, the Church became the abject slave of the State. To us who believe that the Church of England has been almost, as it were by miracle, preserved from merging into a Protestant sect under the Tudors, and from being utterly extinguished in the time of the Stuart dynasty, all the acts of Elizabeth, little as we can sympathize with them, afford matter for thanksgiving to Almighty God, who seems to have preserved us to be in His good time the honoured instruments towards repairing the broken unity of the Church. For it must be remembered that, though separated from the Western Church, it is not true, as Mr. Child observes at p. 273, that the Church of England has been severed from and excommunicated by the great body of the Catholic Church just because the Pontiff of the West disowns us. Many attempts, no doubt mostly failures owing to disastrous circumstances, have been made to open relations between ourselves and the Eastern Churches; and recent communications between the Archbishop of Canterbury and one of the Eastern patriarchs are hopeful signs of a real intercommunion in which the Eastern Church as a body shall acknowledge the Church of England to be in possession of a true apostolical succession both in its episcopate and in its doctrines, just as we have always recognized her Orders and her teaching.

Such ideas as these Mr. Child looks upon as entirely

untenable, and, indeed, he scarcely scruples to consider as contemptible ; at least so we interpret his words.

'And as the latter,' *i.e.* the Catholic Church, meaning thereby the Western branch of the Catholic Church, 'was before precisely that which it has continued since, it is clear that the former, *i.e.* the Church of England, must have been something not the same ; and it is not the mere retention of a few names and titles used in a kind of "second intention" and a few more or less maimed and amputated rites which will ever make persons intelligently instructed believe that an establishment which obviously is the mere creature of a single State is the legitimate and adequate representation of that imposing and magnificent Western Church which is older than any existing State in Europe, and grander than anything that the world has ever seen, and which has been picturesquely described by an old writer as "the ghost of the old Roman Empire sitting robed and crowned upon the grave thereof"' (p. 273).

And yet Mr. Child admits that the theory of the identity of the Post-Reformation Church in this country with that which existed before Tudor times is extensively held ; whilst we in our turn freely admit that no such idea could have existed in the days of Elizabeth, that not a whisper of an apostolical succession was ever heard, and not a syllable of any such doctrine is to be found in the writings of Elizabethan divines until the celebrated sermon of Bancroft's was preached and published in the year of the destruction of the Spanish Armada. Such facts as these cannot be gainsaid, and, indeed, they furnish a very strong argument in defence of the present Church that she should have had the power to recover from such a state of degradation. It is for the present generation of Churchmen to see that the Church does not recede from the vantage ground secured to her by the commissioners of the Savoy Conference. And we do not scruple to say that any the slightest acquiescence in the judgment whether of the Privy Council or any court whatever which should contravene the plain meaning of the Ornaments Rubric would be the first downward step towards the entire destruction of the Church of this country.

In the concluding chapter of the volume Mr. Child sums up his final conclusions under fourteen heads ; but, as he candidly observes, 'some of these conclusions'—and he might have said with truth nearly all of them—'appertain to Church history exclusively, and not to a history of the relations of Church and State.' To him the distinction is trivial ; in our view it is vital. In nearly all of these heads we can concur with him entirely, and we are not concerned here to notice

any o
in thi
fifth,
dissen

'4.
whatev
submis

'5.
which
but na

A

of th
writte

he ha
taken

believ
which

his w
the w

sure t
the F

Christ
under

view—
body

witho
leave

attach
eviden

finde
suppo

fully
us ma

be th
Supre

author
of arl

abuse
for th

rating
firmly

W
to ou

not b
one-t

any of these further than we have already touched upon them in this article. Their whole sting consists in the fourth and fifth, which we quote as being the two from which we entirely dissent. They are as follows :—

'4. That the Act of Supremacy transferred the whole power—whatever that might have been—of the Pope to the King, while the submission of the clergy bound them to entire dependence upon him.

'5. That Henry thus for the first time created a National Church, which was, in truth, schismatical, and of which he himself was in all but name Pope' (p. 277).

All the other twelve are used as illustrations in proof of these two, for the sake of which the whole book was written. Mr. Child has held a brief for Erastianism, and he has pleaded his cause extremely well. Neither has he taken up the case, as a special pleader might, without fully believing in its righteousness. The evident *gusto* with which the book is written plainly shows that he has thrown his whole heart into the matter, and the ability with which the work has been done is such that the reader may feel sure that the most has been made for the condemnation of the Established Church as a true branch of the Church of Christ in a sense such as the readers of this Review would understand the term. Whether the author has any ulterior view—as, for instance, as to the fusion of Protestants into one body by sacrificing dogma—it is useless to enquire ; or whether without such unity of co-operation he would be content to leave everyone to find his faith for himself from the Bible, attaching himself to no community, there is absolutely no evidence on which to form an opinion. The writer has confined his attention to one subject and such facts as he supposes bear upon it. And in doing this he has not wilfully distorted historical facts. The chief difference between us may be briefly stated thus : What Mr. Child considers to be the necessary and inevitable consequences of the Royal Supremacy we attribute to the scandalous conduct of the authorities in the Church in submitting to the undue exercise of arbitrary power on the part of the sovereign. That the abuse of that power has been overruled by Divine Providence for the preservation of the Church of England from degenerating into a Calvinistic sect of Congregationalists, we most firmly believe.

We have already exceeded the limits which we proposed to ourselves at the commencement of this article ; but it would not be fair to the author if we neglected to notice that fully one-third of the volume is occupied by an Appendix of Notes,

which contain much valuable information, and another Appendix of Statutes, in which latter there are printed, nearly at length, all the Statutes which bear directly on the subject-matter of the volume, from the 23rd year of Henry VIII. down to the 39th of Elizabeth. This will be very convenient, as every student of the history of the Reformation must have felt the difficulty involved in having to refer to the huge volumes of the statutes, which for the most part can only be found in public libraries.

The first Appendix consists of eight notes, the first two containing some important extracts from State Papers of the period; but the note which is longest and most elaborate is that which appears as No. 6, on 'Orders in the Church of England,' which is meant to sustain the author's conclusion that 'it can be proved beyond reasonable doubt that episcopal orders were not insisted upon in practice in the Church of England as an indispensable condition to ministry down to the Great Rebellion, or in one or two instances even after it' (p. 293).

We indeed wonder that the author should have taken so much trouble to prove what no one would attempt to question; but if the instances alleged prove anything they prove too much, for it is quite as certain that in Elizabeth's reign mere laymen officiated in the Church as it is that men possessed of Genevan orders and Presbyterians were allowed to administer sacraments. In no such cases can violations of law be admitted as evidence that the law did not exist; and again we ask, How is the change that has come over the face of the Church since the disastrous times we have been dealing with to be accounted for? In the last note of the appendix the author gives his opinion on the alleged corruption of the clergy in the sixteenth century. We heartily wish we could in any material degree differ from his estimate of the wickedness of many of the monasteries. That the accounts have been greatly exaggerated is tolerably certain, but there is enough told by unwilling witnesses to make one shudder at the vices practised in some of the monastic houses, and to justify Wolsey's attempt to reform some and suppress others; whilst on the other hand we see no reason for the sweeping extension of the charge to the secular clergy. The picture of the state of the religious houses which was brought to light in the Camden Society's volume on the suppression of the monasteries, some forty years ago, has only been darkened by the entries in Mr. Gairdner's recent volume of *State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.* We do not doubt that many of the reports issued by Cromwell's infamous commissioners

are d
and c
the le
dated
must
is no
as for
given
yet w
monks
spaire
taken

It
by th
the vi
but ev
and m
have
the co
the st
ninet
during

A
conclu
differ
facts
dispos
been
course
period
away.
the R
another
from
the re
increa
Church
to the
since
hope f
good p
union
bishop
side b
West.

are downright lies, and many more grossly misrepresented and exaggerated; yet if there were no other evidence than the letter addressed by Foxe, Bishop Winchester, to Wolsey, dated January 2, 1521, there is enough to show how terrible must have been the state of things in that diocese, which there is no reason to suppose was exceptionally bad. He says that as for himself, though within his own small jurisdiction he had given nearly all his study to the work for nearly three years, yet whenever he had to correct and punish he found the monks so depraved, so licentious and corrupt, that he despaired of any proper reformation till the work was undertaken on a more general scale and with a stronger arm.

It is true that Dr. Jessopp's recent publication, also issued by the Camden Society, gives a more favourable account of the visitations of the monasteries in the diocese of Norwich; but even here, though the crimes discovered are the exception and not the rule, there is enough to show that there ought to have been a far more searching enquiry by the bishops into the condition of their dioceses—enough at least to show that the state of the Church of England at the close of the nineteenth century is far more hopeful than it has ever been during the four preceding centuries.

At the risk of repeating what has been already said we conclude our review of Mr. Child's book with pointing out the different conclusion which we draw from the dismal array of facts he has enumerated, the reality of which we have no disposition to contest or to depreciate. His intention has been to represent the Church as hopelessly Erastian, and of course it did not fall within his province to look forward to a period when such a forlorn state of things has entirely passed away. We have referred to a lecture on the 'Principles of the Reformation.' We should like to draw his attention to another lecture by the same author, entitled 'The Recovery from the Principles of the Reformation.' To us the horrors of the reign of the last of the Tudors, as contrasted with the increased and increasing holiness of life in members of the Church in this nineteenth century, and the steady resistance to the usurpation on the part of the State which has set in since the iniquitous judgment in the Gorham case, are full of hope for the future that this Anglican Church may yet in God's good providence be the honoured instrument in promoting the union of the Eastern and Western Churches, and that her bishops may take their seat in the eighth Œcumenical Council side by side with bishops from the East and from the farther West.

ART. X.—DEAN LEFROY'S 'CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.'

1. *The Christian Ministry: its Origin, Constitution, Nature and Work: a Contribution to Pastoral Theology.* By WILLIAM LEFROY, D.D., Dean of Norwich. (London, 1890.)
2. *The Ministry of the Christian Church.* By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House. (London, 1889.)
3. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* The Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall. (London, 1881.)

TEN years ago Dr. Hatch—alas! that we should have to say the late Dr. Hatch—startled the ecclesiastical world by putting forward from an advanced Broad Church point of view, in the Bampton Lectures for 1880, a novel and original scheme of the development of the organization of the early Church. Dr. Hatch's work was admittedly characterized by a powerful style, singular erudition in certain spheres of knowledge, and a rare faculty for selecting and marshalling facts so as to present them in the light most attractive for his theory. With not inferior ability, with characteristic moderation, and with knowledge which, if not equal to Dr. Hatch's in some outlying departments or in acquaintance with the by-ways of Teutonic speculation, was more than a match in familiarity with the primary sources of ecclesiastical history, the Principal of the Pusey House approached the same subject two years ago in his *Ministry of the Christian Church*. And to complete the triangular duel, the Dean of Norwich now steps into the arena as the representative of the third great school of thought in the Church of England. His Donnellan Lectures on the *Christian Ministry* were delivered, internal evidence would suggest, in the interval between the publication of the Bampton Lectures and of Mr. Gore's book, for the first six lectures form a more or less organic whole, of which the four on the Divine Origin, and on the Constitution, of the Christian Ministry keep in steady view Dr. Hatch and his German colleague Professor Harnack, while the seventh and eighth, on Apostolic Succession and on Sacerdotalism, are of the nature of a postscript, and attack the position taken up by Mr. Gore.

Dr. Hatch's object was to strip the Church and its ministry

of all
on str
found
Churc
and H
appoi
and t
organ
of the
natur
prima
chara
religio
that i
inheri
know
or, to
admin
body,
Two
sively
Jewis
'elder
and t
was p
Chris
and t
conse
Chris
in the
clergy
trato
the e
The
tion,
same
with
coun
was
that,
not a
func
teach
disci
it fai

of all Divine claims and sanctions, and to explain their genesis on strictly natural grounds. Our Lord, he would tell us, founded no Church—at least in the ordinary sense of the Church as 'an aggregate of visible and organized societies'—and His apostles organized no ministry as of authoritative appointment. The tendency of the times was to organization, and the presumption was that the early Christians would organize, just as contemporary Pagans did; the differentiation of their body from other similar bodies lay, not in any supernatural character, not in the Divine promise, but in the primary stress it laid on almsgiving, thus uniting a leading characteristic of Judaism with the outward forms adopted by religious Paganism. This primary stress suggested naturally that its chief officers or officer should, together with the duties, inherit the name by which the administrator of alms was known in Pagan guilds, that, namely, of *ἐπίσκοπος*, 'bishop'; or, to put it conversely, the 'bishop' meant originally the administrator of the corporate revenues of the local Christian body, and the 'deacons' were his subordinates in that capacity. Two of the three orders of the later ministry were thus exclusively Pagan in origin; the third was jointly Pagan and Jewish. Not only were all communities of Jews governed by 'elders' ('presbyters'), but the municipalities had their senates and the guilds their councils, in all of which special respect was paid to seniority. But the distinguishing functions of the Christian officers were borrowed from their Jewish homonyms, and the presbyters thus exercised discipline and administered consensual jurisdiction. Such being the rationale of the Christian ministry, it is a natural and a logical deduction that in the Christian Church was no essential difference between clergy and laity. The councillor of a guild, or its administrator of alms, was in no way separable, except for purposes of the expediency of the moment, from his fellow-guildsmen. The official elected for one term might fail to secure re-election, and become the private member of the next. In the same way ordinations in the Church were made and unmade with facility, for 'ordination' itself was in its origin merely the counterpart of secular appointment to office. Since ordination was thus nothing more than a form, it is not surprising to find that, although the officers as such had a prior right, they had not an exclusive right to the performance of any ecclesiastical function. Laymen, no less than officers, could upon occasion teach or preach, baptize, celebrate the Eucharist, or exercise discipline; and the Montanist movement, though in the end it failed, was a powerful and well nigh a successful reassertion

of the original conception that ecclesiastical office meant only priority of order.

Dr. Hatch sums up his historical positions as two: the development of the organization of the Christian Churches was gradual, and the elements of which that organization was composed were already existing in human society. The theological corollary which he wishes to draw from this conception of history is that it is superfluous to ask whether this or that institution is or is not primitive; we should rather ask whether all that was primitive was intended to be permanent. To this question the probable answer is negative: fixity of form from age to age is impossible. Form there must be, but the Christian Church has shown at once its vitality and its divinity by readjusting its form in successive ages. Originally a democracy—compelled by circumstances to become a monarchy—it may one day return to democracy again.

This sketch of Dr. Hatch's position is taken almost verbatim from the luminous abstract prefixed to his lectures. And yet we are conscious that we have scarcely done him justice; our only purpose has been to analyze what the ordinary reader, possibly the writer himself, has looked on as the crucial portion of the book, its account of the *origines* of the ministry, and we have, therefore, omitted from our survey those lectures which treat of developments introduced in the fourth and succeeding centuries, principally by the changed relations resulting from the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the State. For part of this later period Dr. Hatch's knowledge was nearly unique; and, apart from controversy, it would, we believe, be admitted that these chapters are his most valuable contribution to the science of ecclesiastical history. So it must be clearly understood that, when in the course of this review we mention Dr. Hatch's book, it is only of the earlier, and, as it seems to us, less valuable, portion of it of which we shall be speaking.

Mr. Gore's volume is much more homogeneous than Dr. Hatch's. It is 'an apology for the principle of the Apostolic Succession,' and is, in fact, entirely directed to the answer of the question, whether the Episcopate is an essential element in the life of the Christian Church. But within its limits, this book is the fuller and more complete of the two. Dr. Hatch pictured the early history of the Church in the light of a theory, and, with that object, selected portions of the evidence and ignored the rest, and we are far from imputing blame to him for this. Any writer who propagates a theory which he believes will clear up what was before obscure is at

libert
striki
task
comp
cours
with
favou
draw
Chur
much
least
and c

M
assur
be tr
an af
the M
book
histo
hims
itself
ment
him,
defen
ask,
'wha
Apos
Dr. H
colou
conta
Apos
the F
natur
histo
and t
to D
while
quest
agree
but,
seem
he w
'the a
That
who v

liberty to choose, in the first instance, what seem the most striking confirmations of his view, and to leave to others the task of determining whether the rest of the evidence is compatible with it. At the same time the reader is, of course, prepared to follow more readily when he finds, as with Mr. Gore, that no evidence, whether at first sight favourable or unfavourable to the main position, is withdrawn from his judgment. *The Ministry of the Christian Church* is more than the mere presentation of a theory; it is much more than simply an answer to Dr. Hatch; at the very least it is a candid attempt to bring together all the evidence, and on the evidence to answer the question set at starting.

Mr. Gore makes, indeed, two assumptions: but they are assumptions necessary for the delimitation of the ground to be traversed in an octavo volume. He supposes, in general, an affirmative answer to all questions of the genuineness of the New Testament books, not in the least because these books are to be exempted more than any others from historical criticism, but simply because, while he is convinced himself, to convince objectors would require a treatise in itself. He is, therefore, quite aware that much of his argument does not apply to Dr. Hatch, or those who hold, like him, that the Pastoral Epistles are 'probably even less defensible' than those to the Ephesians and Colossians, or ask, like him—with what answer in view is clear enough—'what is the relation of the *ἡμεῖς* section of the Acts of the Apostles to the rest of the book?' The speculations of Dr. Hatch and Professor Harnack are, of course, very largely coloured by their attitude towards these documents, which contain the chief evidence concerning the ministry in the Apostolic age; for those who reject the Acts, the Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, will naturally hold, as Harnack admits, quite different views on the history of the Christian ministry to those who accept them, and the objection made, we cannot but think with great reason, to Dr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures was that they postulated, while they did not state, certain very decided views on these questions. Dean Lefroy is here, of course, in much closer agreement with Mr. Gore than with Hatch and Harnack; but, though aware of the divergence of views, he does not seem to grasp the consequent alteration of attitude. Thus he writes that

'the appearance of τὸ πρεσβυτέριον in 1 Tim. iv. 14 is important. . . . That in the year 50 there should be a body known as τὸ πρεσβυτέριον who would co-operate with St. Paul in the solemnities of ordination,

is evidence of the organization which was developed in the Lystran Church. Nor is this deduction at all affected by Professor Harnack's suspicion as to the late date at which the Pastoral Epistles were composed, "in the middle of the second century." Dr. Hatch shares Harnack's view.¹

We agree entirely with the Dean's own estimate of the importance of this evidence, because we also agree with the Dean in believing St. Paul to be the writer of these Epistles. But surely it is unreasonable to expect that those who consider St. Paul a century too early to be the author will attribute an equal value to the evidence of a second century forger. So far as the Dean's argument against Dr. Hatch's position is directed, like Mr. Gore's, to those who accept the New Testament books in the mass as genuine, it is valid enough; but so far as it is directed against those who, with Dr. Hatch's views on the ministry, accept also his views of New Testament criticism, it of course falls harmless.

But the *Ministry of the Christian Church* makes a further assumption as well. It is addressed to those only who accept the New Testament, and accept with the New Testament a doctrine of the Incarnation in the light of which, and of which alone, certain answers to further questions are possible. If Jesus Christ be not Divine, then neither can His Church be. But if the mission of Christ be supernatural, then it is at least conceivable that a Church and ministers which perpetuate His mission may be endowed with supernatural power. And therefore Mr. Gore, addressing Christian readers only, or rather addressing readers from the standpoint of New Testament Christianity, asks first whether Christ did in fact institute a visible Church, and in the first chapter answers this in the affirmative on the convergent testimony of the Christian writers of the second century compared with the New Testament, while the alternative preferred by Dr. Hatch, that the Church owed its form as a society to the influence of contemporary Paganism, is shown to be baseless and contradictory of all the evidence.

Up to this point, again, the Dean follows closely in the footsteps of the Principal of the Pusey House. We are very

¹ *The Christian Ministry*, p. 98, n. 1. It would, we suppose, be too much to expect reasonable views from an extreme Evangelical on Biblical questions, but (putting aside the use of 'Apostle' on p. 455, for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) we cannot pass without protest the preposterous view advanced and defended in the last appendix, that the Bible anticipates scientific discoveries, and is, in fact, a sort of inspired science primer, whose authors were centuries before the times.

far, in
clusion
Christ
Bamp
Catho
which
'the C
interp
of the
speak
solar s
himself
itself
divine
is divi
Mr. G
The p
Apost
the lip

'Or
kingdom
tinuity.
the livi
origin o
the kin
Gospel
St. Mat
pertain
Redeen
'Th
Living
Ghost o
of Chris
... T
tion of
Church
His sov

¹ Ha

² W
notice o
book or
much th
persever
the Red
rejected
and the
State ex
have ant
VOL.

far, indeed, from suggesting that Dr. Hatch's contrary conclusion is based on contrary premisses as to the essentials of Christian theology. There is, we gladly admit, nothing in the Bampton Lectures which excludes an honest belief in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, though there is much which seems to us at variance with a complete grasp of it. If 'the Christian societies . . . were formed without any special interposition of that mysterious and extraordinary action of the divine volition, which for want of a better term we speak of as "supernatural"'—if the Church 'is divine as the solar system is divine,'¹ then others, although not Dr. Hatch himself, might have drawn the conclusion that Christianity itself was formed without any special interposition of the divine volition, and that Jesus Christ is Divine as Buddha is divine. But the extent of Dr. Lefroy's agreement with Mr. Gore does not stop at theology in its strictest sense.² The proclamation of belief in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church comes as fervently and as eloquently from the lips of the one as of the other.

'One society which began then exists now, and but one. One kingdom alone can claim to have unbroken historic and vital continuity. This is the kingdom of Christ. This is "the Church of the living God." It is the new and Divine society, which was in its origin contemporaneous with the great Empire. . . . How largely the kingdom of Christ entered into the teaching of the Saviour, the Gospel of the King abundantly shows, and those who have studied St. Matthew's history will not be surprised to find that "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" formed the theme of the Redeemer's post-resurrection converse with His disciples.

'The Spirit of the Living God must be given if the work of the Living God is to be done. . . . That gift is bestowed. The Holy Ghost descends upon the Apostles and the disciples. The Church of Christ was born of the Spirit of Life. Its birthday was Pentecost. . . . The "I believe in the Holy Ghost" is followed by the affirmation of belief in the society which He created, "the Holy Catholic Church." . . . The [Niceno-Constantinopolitan] creed, asserting His sovereignty, next asserts its highest expression as the "Giver of

¹ Hatch, *B. L.* pp. 18, 20.

² We may be permitted to add here that we have been pleased to notice on certain points which do not affect the main purpose of his book or of our review, and which may, therefore, find mention now, how much there is with which we can fully agree. If the doctrine of final perseverance is one 'which many profound thinkers have read out of the Redeemer's language' (p. 237), yet the doctrine of Reprobation is rejected in terms as strong as any Churchman could wish to use (p. 263), and the doctrine of the Descent into Hades and of the Intermediate State expounded and emphasized much more vigorously than we should have anticipated from a pronounced Evangelical (p. 7, n.).

Life." Each clause is, however, preparatory to the grand enunciation. Each is a step which the ascending faith of the disciple is taught to take, until he rests within the mountain of the Lord's house, "the one Catholic and Apostolic Church." In this he believes as the expression of the energy of, yea, as the creation of, the Sovereign Life-giver, the Holy Ghost.¹

Such a society, Dean Lefroy sees clearly enough, implies an organization.

'If their message to the world was an evangel of intelligence, of culture, of liberty, then it is conceivable that such men as the Twelve would not in the earlier ages of our era be over anxious about organization.'

'There was "no other name under heaven given amongst men whereby they could be saved." There was no other society charged with the world-wide declaration of this message, nor was there any other body within whose pale the blessings which belong to and which flow from membership of the Church of Christ were procurable. Conscious of this, the life and the labours of the pioneers of the Christian ministry are intelligible, are reasonable, are harmonious; and all that we read of division of labour, of authoritative supervision, of permanent ministers appointed in every region which was penetrated by itinerants who believed themselves to be the depositories of the faith, is consistent—consistent in all its parts; consistent with the mutual relation of these emissaries; and consistent too with that continuity of ministry and of message, which was destined in the purpose of God to work out both the perpetuity and the universality of the kingdom of Christ.'

Nor do we find any substantial differences between the Dean and ourselves in the historical explanation of the genesis of the settled Christian ministry, as it has been known and familiar from the second century till the nineteenth. As we have on another occasion pointed out in the columns of this review, the discovery of Bryennios supplies the key which turns the lock and opens the light on to the obscurest decades of Christian history, and to Professor Harnack is due the credit of having been the first to start upon this path of inquiry, and the first to account for the rise of the Episcopate out of the transition from the itinerant to the settled ministry. To what extent the Professor's English colleague, Dr. Hatch, would here have coincided with him we are not able to say. The Bampton Lectures were delivered some years before the publication of the *Didachè*, and the (third) edition which has appeared since Bryennios wrote, is no more than a reprint.²

¹ *Christian Ministry*, pp. 5, 6, 17, 20, 23, 25.

² *Ibid.* p. 132.

³ But it is a great pleasure to think that before Dr. Hatch passed

That
than w
knowle
defecti
confide
Episco
seded;
'is wro
stress
(appare
conclus
an offic
explana
of critic
many o

At
resident
by Mr.
that his
is much
work ou
that he
with mu
Didachè
very mu
the othe
have sur
before M
The De
last wor
word too

But
Harnack
that all
doctrinal
groups r
tance—t
Didachè
the Chur
to the A

from the r
preface pr
upon Mr.

¹ *Mini*

² *Ibid.*

That a book thus produced on the basis of fewer materials than we now possess would be found in the light of our fuller knowledge of the conditions of the problem to be partial and defective, was only to be expected. For instance, we should confidently claim that the theory of the genesis of the Episcopate, the kernel of the whole matter, was now superseded; and, indeed, Dr. Hatch himself had explained that he 'is wrongly supposed to lay any exclusive or even especial stress on the financial character of the ἐπίσκοπος,' and (apparently) would not now have differed from Harnack's conclusion that the *episcopus*, like the deacon, was primarily an officer of worship, though, as Mr. Gore remarks, if this explanation of Dr. Hatch's renders unnecessary a good deal of criticism, it also makes it difficult to see the point of a good many of his arguments and references.¹

At any rate, in this conception of the itinerant and residentiary ministry, Harnack is substantially followed both by Mr. Gore and Dean Lefroy, and when the latter claims that his third lecture 'is an attempt, and I humbly' [the Dean is much too fond of this adverb] 'believe the first attempt, to work out' Harnack's ideas, we must take leave to point out that he cannot have read the *Ministry of the Christian Church*² with much care, or he would have found the evidence of the *Didachè* employed, and the theory of Harnack modified, in very much the same way as he employs the one and modifies the other himself. It is not impossible, indeed, that, as we have surmised, his lectures were composed for the most part before Mr. Gore wrote, but at least they were not published. The Dean has the advantages of criticism, and of saying the last word on matters of dispute; he must not claim the first word too, and the advantages of originality.

But when we speak in general terms of the acceptance of Harnack's theory, we must of course remind our readers that all historical explanations of the episcopate take their doctrinal colouring from their chronology. Harnack himself groups nearly all the original documents of primary importance—the Acts, the Ephesian and Pastoral Epistles, the *Didachè*—into the second century, and the constitution of the Church to which they bear witness, as it does not belong to the Apostolic age, so it cannot lay claim to Apostolic

from the regions of controversy he had in this third edition omitted the preface prefixed to the previous edition, with its somewhat bitter attack upon Mr. Gore's pamphlet.

¹ *Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 407.

² *Ibid.* pp. 276 ff., 335.

sanction. Those writers, on the other hand, who, like Mr. Gore and Dean Lefroy, date those and other documents in the lifetime of the Apostles, naturally see in the episcopate, as it emerges from the settling down of the once itinerant apostle and prophet, an institution of primary authority. We quote once more from the Dean his emphatic testimony to the episcopate as an order of the Church of Christ.

'That ministerial order—threefold, unequal, historic—I believe to have been initiated, accepted, adopted by the Holy Apostles.'

'As we move, in the society now of Ignatius, now of Polycarp, now of Irenaeus, we find ourselves in the presence of men who knew nothing of presbyterian equality. . . . We listen to their counsel. We follow humbly and reverently in their train. We conserve the doctrine with which they were entrusted; and, while the fluctuations of opinion and the impatience of narrowness and the indifference of unbelief may depreciate organisation and may chafe at historical continuity, let us humbly but heartily endeavour to do our Lord's work in our Lord's way, and on the lines of a ministry which can cite for itself everything short of His explicit appointment.'¹

Now this ministry, derived ultimately, as Dean Lefroy admits and claims that it is, from the Apostles themselves, can it be said to be of Divine institution in the sense of being essential to the life of the Church?

Yes, says Mr. Gore: the Church is not only a body, but an organized body, with differentiation of functions impressed upon it from the beginning, and not alterable at the pleasure of the body itself, any more than the natural body could dispense at will with head or hand. No ministry is valid which is assumed—which a man takes upon himself, or which is merely delegated to him from below. The ministerial commission can only be obtained at the hands of men who were in turn commissioned to bestow it. It is a Divine gift, which must be received and cannot be originated. In the language of the Twenty third Article, '*illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est, in ecclesia cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.*'² After explaining not only what the doctrine of Apostolic Succession does mean, but (equally important) what it does not mean, Mr. Gore devotes the next four chapters, forming the main portion of his book, to the examination of this

¹ *Christian Ministry*, pp. 189, 185.

² *Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 62-82.

hypoth
writers
from t
sufficie
the mo
and Ep
hypoth
one an
implied
to by t
latter p
doubted
which m
end, an

No,
passion
are no
unfeign
When
history
of the
Even h
interest
up of t
his pass
and the
difficult
his disj
that we
regards
general
it seem
claiming
typing t
tuting t
secondar
the basis
it is cor
primitive
an Eng
more, b
formular
The
head of
seem to

hypothesis in the light, first, of the witness of Christian writers from the middle of the second century onwards—from the time, that is, when the body of evidence becomes sufficient to warrant unassailable conclusions—and then of the more fragmentary evidence of the Gospels, of the Acts and Epistles, and of the sub-Apostolic age. While all other hypotheses place our authorities at hopeless variance with one another, the Catholic doctrine of the continuous ministry implied in the Gospels, developing in the Epistles, witnessed to by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, and at least from the latter part of the second century 'a fact too palpable to be doubted, and too simple to be misunderstood,' is the link which runs through the evidence from the beginning to the end, and connects it into a harmonious whole.

No, says the Dean of Norwich, with emphasis and with passion. He has reached the parting of the ways, and we are no longer able to travel, as we hitherto have been unfeignedly glad to find ourselves travelling, in his company. When facts are co-ordinated into principles, when from the history of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession is deduced, he at once revolts. Even his fundamental disagreements with Dr. Hatch seem to interest and excite him less than the spectre he has conjured up of the results of admitting the Apostolic Succession, and his passion must have disturbed the balance of his judgment and the clearness of his argument, for it is only with some difficulty that we can throw into consistent and logical form his disjointed and haphazard criticisms. But we believe that we are representing him fairly when we say that he regards Apostolic Succession primarily in the light of the general scheme of Christian doctrine, and that in this sphere it seems to him to violate three essential principles, in claiming to continue the finished work of Christ, in stereotyping the free and continuous gift of grace, and in substituting the idea of the minister for the idea of the Church; secondarily, in its appeal to Scripture it supports itself on the basis of a false exegesis; thirdly, in its appeal to history it is contradicted both by the New Testament and also by primitive antiquity; and, lastly, from the point of view of an English Churchman it has against it the silence—nay more, by implication the disapproval—of all Anglican formularies.

The objections urged by Dean Lefroy under the first head of relationship with the general doctrines of Christianity seem to us largely to rest on misconceptions. Mr. Gore, for

instance, had quoted from Möhler's *Symbolism* the following passage:

'By the Church on earth Catholics understand the visible community of believers, founded by Christ, in which, by means of an enduring apostleship established by Him and appointed to conduct all nations in the course of ages back to God, the works wrought by Him during His earthly life for the redemption and sanctification of mankind are, under the guidance of His Spirit, continued unto the end of the world.'¹

After a passing sniff at the tendency to universalism contained in the 'all nations,' the Dean concentrates himself on the word 'continued,' and declaims against the doctrine he understands to be implied in it as unscriptural and unchristian. But this is a mere confusion. Of course, if either these words or the doctrine of the Succession implied that the one offering of Calvary was capable of repetition, we should agree that the Dean's language would not be too strong. But even if such were Möhler's meaning—and we do not see the slightest reason to suppose that it was—surely Dean Lefroy cannot suppose that Mr. Gore holds a doctrine that would be disowned by many Romanists. But, on the other hand, if the Dean does not believe that our Lord instituted His Church to carry on on earth the work which He had begun, we are at a loss to conceive for what purpose he supposes it to exist at all.

His next point is at first sight of more importance. Mr. Gore had said:—'This essential finality [of Christianity] is expressed in the once for all delivered faith, in the fulness of the once for all given grace, in the visible society once for all instituted.'² Again, the Dean takes up a word and rides off at a tangent. Like Möhler's phrase of which we have spoken, Mr. Gore's 'once for all given grace' is 'unscriptural, un-historic, and un-Anglican.' It is unscriptural because, for instance, while St. Jude speaks of 'the faith once for all delivered,' St. James says, God gives more grace, and St. Peter exhorts his converts to grow in grace. It is unhistoric, because Irenæus and Tertullian, who are appealed to for witness to the episcopal succession from the Apostles as the channel of grace, are speaking always not of grace but of truth, and truth can be handed down, because it was 'once delivered.' With such persistency does the Dean return to

¹ *Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 69, n.; *Christian Ministry*, p. 366.

² *Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 64; *Christian Ministry*, pp. 356 ff., 399 ff.

this co-
prove t
ipso fa
Father
grace
Grace
both, a
pletene
guardia
not rep
former
that G
conseq
Christi
Spirit
veritas.
for ins
increas
if grac
this qu
that G
of His
given:
implies
'final'
he supp
for mo
doctrin
grace'
the Eu
meanin
His Ch
grace i
His Ch
claimed
Lefroy
affected
Last
original
idea, wh
is can p
over al
Societie
the succ
individu

this contrast, that one would think he supposes himself to prove that if the Episcopate is the channel of Divine truth, *ipso facto* it cannot be the channel of Divine grace. But these Fathers never drew the sharp dividing line between truth and grace which is the alphabet of Dean Lefroy's theology. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. In the Church were both, and neither could be possessed by heresy in its completeness. If the bishops represented to Irenæus the guardianship of truth, it will be difficult to show that they did not represent also the guardianship of grace. True, it is the former which he emphasizes; it was enough for him to prove that Gnosticism was alien from the truth, it was a necessary consequence that so far it was alien from the grace, of Christianity. 'Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic Ecclesia et omnis *gratia*; Spiritus autem *veritas*.' Thirdly, this conception is un-Anglican because, for instance, our baptismal office prays that God would increase the knowledge of His grace, and how could this be if grace, like truth, were once for all given? Let us answer this question by another; the prayer of St. Chrysostom asks that God would grant us Christians 'in this world knowledge of His truth,' which cannot be if truth were once for all given: is it not, therefore, obvious that the Prayer Book implies that Christian truth, like Christian grace, is not 'final'? But, in all seriousness, we put it to the Dean, does he suppose there is any Christian whatever who does not pray for more grace? What is the meaning of the Sacramental doctrine for which we High Churchmen contend, if 'more grace' is not continually given to the individual in and through the Eucharist? Is it not as clear as daylight that Mr. Gore's meaning is that a covenant of grace was made by God with His Church once for all, and that, though, of course, God's grace is not limited by His covenant, yet it is only through His Church that the covenanted blessing can be securely claimed. This may or may not be a true conception; Dean Lefroy may agree or disagree with it; but he has at least not affected it by any of his arguments.

Last among this group of objections comes the really original thought that Apostolic Succession is a schismatic idea, which no one who has a full grasp of what the Church is can possibly tolerate. The rights which every society has over all its members are powerless in this greatest of all Societies against its episcopal members. The powers which the succession bestows are bestowed on individuals, and these individuals are at liberty each of them to multiply the

possessors of Apostolic prerogative as, when, and how, he chooses. Now, deferring for a moment the question whether this is a correct representation of the Catholic doctrine of Episcopacy, let us see whither Dean Lefroy's own view would lead him:—

'The restraint of authority is a higher function than the exercise of it. For the people to restrain involves in the end their right to bestow. This is, practically, the destruction of any theory which localizes Divine authority in the succession of Apostles. It is also the maintenance of the rights of the Divine Society to which Christ has promised His Presence.'¹

That is to say, if the people cannot in the last resort depose their ministers, the presence of Christ does not remain with His Church. Well, this theory only suggests one question to us: is it in accordance with the Dean's reading of the Acts of the Apostles that St. Peter could have been deposed—not by his fellow Apostles, but—by the laity of the Pentecostal Church? If the Dean answers yes, we admit him to be consistent, but scarcely to be scriptural; if no, then it would seem that the Pentecostal Church was deprived of the presence of Christ, and the catholic communities of to-day need at least fear no comparison with their earliest predecessors.

But what is the true conception of the relation of the Episcopate to the Church, so grievously misrepresented by the Dean? In the first place, episcopal consecration, as is pointed out by every writer on the subject, and as the Dean must know, is only one part of a bishop's equipment; to act as bishop he requires the authority of the Church however expressed, and acts in defiance of such authorization are uncanonical and schismatic. In the second place, the prerogatives of the individual bishop are in some degree limited by the federation of bishops, and the federation in turn consists, of course, only of bishops having authority to act as such in dioceses.² In the third place, a bishop is not even within the limits of his diocese an arbitrary and absolute monarch. St. Cyprian is the typical champion of episcopacy, and every

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 354.

² We cannot help saying in passing that Mr. Gore (*Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 73, and elsewhere) seems to us to minimize one most important side of Episcopacy. We should be inclined to say that *monepiscopacy*—the 'singularity in succeeding' which Bishop Bilson (whose definition is criticized by Mr. Gore) attributes to bishops as well as 'superiority to ordaining'—is an essential factor of the doctrine, and that the omission to lay stress on this exposes Mr. Gore to some extent to this objection of the Dean's.

syllable of Dean Lefroy's account of the Episcopate is contradicted by every page of St. Cyprian. There we find the bishop in close touch with his laity, in consultation with his clergy, in alliance with his brethren the bishops of the province. And in proportion as that ideal is nearly reached, episcopacy becomes the key to unity. The individual bishop is the representative of his diocese—where primitive conditions prevail, freely and directly elected by clergy and laity—and the symbol of its unity. The federation of bishops is the expression of the unity in diversity of the Church at large. And in this way the episcopal system, according to which the bishops are the Church by representation, is absolutely and utterly inconsistent with Papalism, so that it is naturally as easy for Dr. Lefroy to quote Cardinal Newman and Möhler against Mr. Gore on this subject as it would be on any other where Roman ideas have supplanted primitive ones.

So much for objections based on the general postulates of Christian doctrine: we pass to the consideration of an objection based on the exegesis of Scripture.¹ Our Lord promised that 'Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained,' and problems arising from these words acquire in Dean Lefroy's eyes an even disproportionate importance. If we were to believe him, it is necessary for the upholders of Apostolic Succession to maintain in the first place that this commission was spoken to the Apostles only, and next, that this formula must be repeated at every ordination, or the succession to the Apostles' commission is invalidated. Briefly, the Dean argues that as the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist² require for their proper fulfilment a divinely appointed formula, such also must be the case with ordination if sacramentally regarded. But the only words of our Lord which can be construed into such a formula are those of which we are now speaking, and consequently where those words are absent, there the Sacrament of Orders and the Apostolic Succession cannot be bestowed. To this conclusion Dr. Pusey is quoted as witnessing:—

'In truth the significance of this line of argument was recognized by one who holds quite as strong a place in the history of the Movement as the writer of the tract which denies the relevancy of the words to the grace bestowed by ordination.³ Dr. Pusey spoke

¹ *Christian Ministry*, pp. 371 ff., 385 ff.

² Dean Lefroy needs to be reminded that it is not so certain as to be assumed without argument that the Sacrament of the Eucharist can be consecrated only by the recital of the words of institution.

³ Dr. Newman in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 1.

strongly, and felt deeply, and wrote deliberately his conviction upon this point. "So long as those words of our Lord, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven,' are repeated over us when we are ordained, so long will there be confession in the Church of England."

Really, the perusal of some hundred pages of Dean Lefroy's writing has brought us face to face with many things to astonish us, but with nothing we think that quite equalled the picture of Dr. Newman (with the Church in general) maintaining that for the Sacrament of Ordination a necessary act but no necessary words had been prescribed, of Dean Lefroy with Dr. Pusey—Dr. Pusey steeped to the very marrow with primitive and patristic lore—asserting, on the contrary, that it is by the words in question alone that ministerial grace could conceivably be given. Of course, Dr. Lefroy proceeds to demonstrate triumphantly that there is no evidence for this use of the words for thirteen hundred years after Christ, and thus not only illustrates the lateness of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, but places Dr. Pusey in company with mediæval Romanism against the consensus of primitive and Eastern usages. When such nonsense as this is logically deduced, it is natural to suspect that the conclusion reflects back some error of the premisses, and, indeed, anyone more versed than the Dean in Catholic theology would have seen at once, first, that Dr. Pusey was referring exclusively to the power of ministerial absolution committed by these words to all priests of the Church of England, Dean Lefroy included, and, secondly, that anything which Dr. Pusey claimed for himself was *ipso facto* unconnected with the Apostolic Succession, by which we mean primarily those powers of ordination and of transmitting the Apostolic commission which are reserved to the Episcopate alone. Dr. Pusey knew quite as well as Dr. Newman that it is an utterly impossible view to bind up, as Dean Lefroy would do, the repetition of this formula with the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. It becomes, therefore, for our immediate purpose, of comparatively slight importance whether the words were spoken to the Apostles only, as we ourselves, following Mr. Gore,¹ believe (just as we also believe that the Pentecostal gift was poured out on the Apostles alone), or, as Dean Lefroy argues, to others also: the doctrine of the ministry is not affected, for, as the power bestowed is not confined to the bishops but extends also to the priests, as of other Churches, so of the

¹ *Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 229.

Chu
bism

emp
Dr.

anti
thes

Apo
—th

othe
whic

the

'Nec
dare

impo
Nos

nostr
hoc

In
pati

cate

that

deri

the

wher

subs

Aug

a w

had

nam

the

and

self.

orga

tion

petu

othe

thes

tinia

Dr.

Hat

Church of England, why should it have been confined to the bishops' predecessors, the Apostles?

But we have not yet done with Dean Lefroy's exhaustive employment of the same argument. It can not only prove Dr. Pusey to be in contradiction to thirteen centuries of antiquity, but it can, of course, prove at the same time that these thirteen centuries were ignorant of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, for the argument which the Dean adopts—the absence of this formula of ordination—is as valid for any other writer of these centuries as for the particular instance to which he applies it. St. Augustine, speaking of the gift of the Holy Ghost, writes:—

'Neque Scriptura prius dixerat, Videns autem Simon quod apostoli darent Spiritum Sanctum, sed dixerat, Videns autem Simon quod per impositionem manuum apostolorum daretur Spiritus Sanctus. . . . Nos autem accipere quidem hoc donum possumus pro modulo nostro; effundere autem super alios non utique possumus, sed ut hoc fiat Deum super eos a quo efficitur invocamus.'¹

In the Dean's eyes such language 'is absolutely incompatible with belief in the Apostolic Succession as communicated or continued by derived grace.' 'It is equally clear that St. Augustine did not accept the theory of the official derivation of grace. It is no less clear he did not believe in the principle of Apostolic Succession.' We cannot say whether the Dean would be surprised to know that we could subscribe *ex animo* to every word he has quoted from St. Augustine; but surely he ought to be surprised to find that a writer, of whom he says, 'with sacerdotalism Dr. Hatch had not even an approach to sympathy,'² labels with the name of the Saint who 'did not believe in the principle of the Apostolic Succession' exactly that view of the Church and ministry represented by Mr. Gore and opposed by himself. That the 'Church is an aggregation of visible and organized societies'; that baptism 'is a ceremony of initiation into a Divine society'; that our Lord 'instituted a perpetual ministry, or empowered [His disciples] to transmit to other persons the same awful prerogative' of forgiving sins, these are assumptions which follow on—what?—'the Augustinian theory of the nature of the Church.' We must leave Dr. Lefroy to reconcile his own anti-sacerdotalism with Dr. Hatch's as best he can.

However, the Dean does not always display the same

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 394; *Aug. De Trinitate*, xv. 26.

² *Christian Ministry*, pref. p. vii.

anxiety to claim antiquity on his side. In fact, we have not discovered anyone after Tertullian—by Cyprian's time 'Apostolic truth had been adulterated'¹—with the sole exception of St. Augustine, to whose opinion the Dean would attach any value, and we are afraid that St. Augustine owes this fortunate exemption rather to his supposed tenets on certain other theological questions than to any real divergence from his contemporaries on the subjects in dispute; and the authority of his contemporaries is contemptuously dismissed. Theodoret, whose episcopate overlapped St. Augustine's, was 'literally cradled in legends,' 'This strong conclusion' (that ministerial grace was independent of ordination) 'will not be acceptable,' admits the Dean, 'to those who regard with reverence, and receive as though they were authoritative, the ecclesiastical saint lore of the fourth and fifth century.'² We need not stop to enlarge on the ignorance which can group under this sweeping condemnation the generations which produced Athanasius and Basil, the Gregories and Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine, Cyril and Leo, with others too numerous to name—beyond question the most marvellous galaxy of intellect which the Church of Christ has ever known. Nor can we offer to relieve the Dean of the task of reconciling this scant reverence for antiquity with the standpoint of a Church which takes as its measure and standard the primitive church 'by the space of five hundred years after Christ's ascension.' We must pass to the consideration of the authorities claimed on his side, the Fathers, that is, of the second century. And here we will premise that we are glad to find that his sympathies—unlike those of some of his friends, who apparently consider that Gospel religion came to a sudden end about the year 100 A.D. with the publication of St. John's Epistle—really extend so far. We will pardon him the narrowness which stops short where it does, in the hope that a careful study of Clement and Ignatius, of Irenæus and Tertullian, will some day lead him to a closer grasp of the truths to which they, no less than the later Fathers, witness.

Of the Dean's employment of Irenæus we have had occasion to speak already. In the case of Tertullian, he devotes several pages to the proof that this writer, even as a Catholic, admitted the right of laymen to baptize,³ in opposition, as he obviously imagines, to Mr. Gore, whom, by means of an ingenious 'etc.' he manages to represent as positively denying this right. Mr. Gore argued that 'the individual life

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 383 n.² *Id. ib.*³ *Ibid.* p. 487 ff.

can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution—of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments;¹ and the Dean, in quoting these words, omits the mention of three of these sacraments, and paraphrases 'regeneration, etc.,' with the intention and result of emphasizing (what Mr. Gore had not done) the relation of the ministry to baptism. Modern High Churchmanship and Christian antiquity being thus represented at issue with one another, Dr. Lefroy concludes that to the latter, 'the sacerdotal notion which regards the officiant as an exclusive vehicle of grace, was unknown,' and proceeds to ask if 'laymen have a right to administer one sacrament, why should they be denied the administration of the other?'² We had fancied, till we fell in with the Dean of Norwich, that everyone knew that Church law recognized the right and duty of laymen in cases of necessity to baptize, as universally as it has denied to laymen under any circumstances the right of consecrating the holy Eucharist. Nay, surely the Dean remembers that it was the Puritans of the seventeenth century who formulated the narrower view as against the Church of England, and that to this day, while the Church recognizes lay baptism, Presbyterianism rejects it.

When Dean Lefroy asks³ whether Tertullian's language is that 'of a theologian who believed that the generation which was ministered to by those who were thus admitted to the ranks of a rival ministry was separated from Divine grace'—whether, if he had believed in Apostolic Succession, he would not 'have denounced the apostates as imperilling the salvation of souls'—we can only say that to us his language does seem that of a theologian who believed (we are far from following him in this or other matters) that apostacy did more than 'imperil' salvation, and that this characteristic of his belief is imprinted on every page of his controversial writings.

¹ *Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 94.

² In this connexion we must put in a protest against what looks like a bit of sharp practice which would be unworthy of the Dean. He quotes here from Mr. Gore the words 'There was no sharp line yet drawn in respect of the layman's power between Baptism and the Eucharist.' Thinking the sentiment unlike Mr. Gore, we turned to the reference (*Ministry of the Christian Church*, p. 206), and found that what Mr. Gore really wrote was that 'if this passage could be fairly quoted as evidence of the mind of the Church at the time, it would go at least to show that there was no sharp line,' &c., and proceeds to point out that the passage is both actually and characteristically Montanist.

³ *Christian Ministry*, p. 406.

From Tertullian the Dean works back to Ignatius, and claims the Apostolic Father equally as a witness against the Apostolic Succession, forgetful, it would seem, that among many other phrases exalting the Episcopate, St. Ignatius definitely declines to recognize a non-Episcopal Church. 'Without these three orders no Church has a title to the name.'¹ Contrast this with Dean Lefroy's own position. He does not consider episcopacy as necessary an order in the Church of Christ as either the diaconate or the priesthood,² and he is consistent in doing so. But we wonder that he does not see that those who refuse, like St. Ignatius, to recognize Presbyterianism do so for some reason, because of some belief, which Dean Lefroy does not share with them. That reason is the Apostolic Succession. That belief is the belief which we share with St. Ignatius.

When we pass from the Church history of the second century to the Church history of the Apostolic age, it is somewhat surprising to find that Dean Lefroy becomes even more jejune.³ Two or three pages are devoted to examining the evidence of the Acts and Epistles with regard to ordinations, but even these consist mostly of such rhetorical questions as the following :—

'Did the Apostles transmit the grace of which they were the "first depositaries" to the seven deacons? . . . Did the prophets and teachers of Antioch transmit "apostolic grace" to Barnabas? If they did, whence did they receive it? . . . Did St. Paul transmit apostolic grace to St. Timothy? Was it also imparted by the Lystran presbyters? But where did they acquire it?'⁴

To these questions the ideal reader is supposed to reply in the negative; but, for ourselves, we should, of course, be prepared to answer all of them confidently in the affirmative. Nay, since Mr. Gore has discussed these very points,⁵ and the Dean has presumably read the book he has set himself to criticize, we are driven to conclude that the rhetorical question

¹ Ign. *ad Trall.* 3.

² *Christian Ministry*, p. 333 n.

³ But we should like to correct Dean Lefroy's argument from silence here by an admirable passage of his own earlier in the book (p. 71). Speaking of the Resurrection, the Atonement, the Eucharist, &c., he asks 'Would it be right or even reasonable to reject these doctrines or to disregard these practices because they were omitted by some one writer? Are we to conclude that the author of the "Book of Esther" was an agnostic or an atheist? That the Eucharist was unknown to the Churches of Thessalonica, of Galatia, of Rome, of Ephesus, or Philippi, or of the Valley of the Lycus?' &c.

⁴ *Christian Ministry*, p. 383.

⁵ *Ministry of the Christian Church*, ch. v.

was the only effective weapon left in the Dean's armoury ; and this, though it may be effective platform oratory, does not amount to substantial history.

We have reserved to the last the consideration of an objection which stands on its own ground. Hitherto we have followed the Dean as he ranges vaguely over the wide fields of Christian doctrine, or Scriptural exegesis, or Church history from Tertullian back to the Apostles. But he also objects to Apostolic Succession that it is not the doctrine of the Church of England. Mr. Gore has sedulously avoided overcrowding his book with a discussion, which would require a volume in itself, on Succession in the Church of England, by which we mean not only the fact of the validity of the Episcopal succession itself, but the value which has been laid on it as a doctrine ; although some day we hope that either he himself, or some other representative Churchman, may follow up the *Ministry of the Christian Church* by a treatise of the nature we have described. Meanwhile Dean Lefroy is in sole possession of this ground, and the last duty of our uncongenial task of criticism will be to see how he acquits himself on it.

But the Dean's theory of the Reformation is not so well based on history as to give us much confidence in his guidance. If we were to believe him,¹ the English Reformation centred round the question of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist ; and yet he must know, that if this were true, the Reformation would be, in the eyes of every High Churchman, a national sin. But, thank God, it is not true. It may be true that it was the chief point of controversy with the Marian martyrs, but the Marian martyrs were very far from being the Church of England. They represented a party which was never in power in the Church except at the close of Edward the Sixth's reign, and of that party our opinion, were we to express it, would be far from complimentary. They certainly were not represented by the Elizabethan settlement, for Elizabeth, Parker, and Cecil are the names which symbolize and recall the close of the first act of the English Reformation ; and Elizabeth, Parker, and Cecil lived all through Mary's reign in full communion with the Church.

That there did exist such a thing as the Church of England before the Reformation Dean Lefroy admits, for he pledges himself to show that 'sacerdotalism,' while recognized and authorized in it up till that time, was then deliberately and finally excluded.² This admission is an important one, for it implies, however distantly, the recognition of the historic

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 495.

² *Ibid.* p. 493.

truth of the corporate continuity of the Church, and the continuity, therefore, of all teaching not definitely and expressly modified. Consequently, very much of what the Dean in an earlier passage¹ urges as to the silence of the Church of England would be useless, even if true, until he proceeds to show by contrast with pre-Reformation formularies that the Church can be supposed to have altered her standpoint. Such modification he does indeed attempt to make good with regard to Eucharistic doctrine (though even there the Scottish Prayer Book stares him in the face), but no such attempt is even made in the case of the Apostolic Succession. On the contrary, the whole of his negative argument falls to the ground before a single positive indication of the doctrine of the English Church such as we possess in the formula of ordination. The more fully the Dean can prove that the 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' is mediæval and not primitive, the more remarkable an indication of her substantial agreement on the doctrine of the ministry with the mediæval Church is our Church's retention of this formula. The Church of England rules that her bishops should be consecrated with the words, 'Receive the Holy Spirit for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God.' The Dean of Norwich, on the other hand, would appear to deny to consecration any real meaning, for it is his opponent's ideas, and not his own, that he is summing up when he writes,²

'The powers thus claimed for, possessed, and transmitted by bishops become theirs through consecration. This is asserted, accepted, and defended. A bishop-nominate possesses humbler and fewer powers and privileges before his consecration than he does after it. Consecration is thus a ceremony of the most profound importance.'

If a bishop-nominate does not possess 'humbler and fewer powers and privileges' than a consecrated bishop, then a Church which solemnly endows him with the gift of the Holy Ghost is surely entangling herself in blasphemous fables and dangerous deceptions. So long as the words of absolution and the words of ordination stand in the Prayer Book of the Church of England, so long will that Church be accounted by Protestant sects 'sacerdotal'; so long will the Dean's argument from silence refute itself; and so long will the doctrine of Apostolic Succession be taught in the Church as the recognised basis of all her teaching on the ministry.

But the Dean must be given the credit of seeing, what is

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 326 ff.

² *Ibid.* p. 385.

not al
such a
show
that h
tion, a
the pr
claim
not so
The m
exclus
for it
Oxford
the ce
were r
doctri
rubric
and d
necess
servic
it foll
the re
true e
ism bo
near r
justify
is an
entire
previo
subsec
bishop
the se
And i
will pu
questi
St. Ign
from
episco
lawful
painfu

¹ *CA*
² *On*
Episcop
defence
be a se
come to
Order i

VOL

not always seen, that it is not enough to assert vaguely that such and such beliefs are 'Reformation principles,' or even to show that they prevailed in the sixteenth century; he sees that he must follow on to the final act of the English Reformation, and argue that the Caroline revision of the Prayer Book, the present standard of the Church of England, bears out his claims. We reproduce his only argument in this direction, not so much for its intrinsic merit as for its splendid audacity. The revisers, he premises, cannot have been ignorant of the exclusive claim for the Episcopate now made by Mr. Gore, for it had already been made by Archbishop Laud in his Oxford exercise for the degree of B.D. at the beginning of the century. So far we go with him; they cannot, for they were men of deep patristic learning, have been ignorant of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. But, argues the Dean,¹ the rubrics preceding the two services for ordination of priests and deacons provide for a sermon showing in each case 'how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ'; before the service for consecration of a bishop there is no such rubric: it follows that the Order of Bishops was not considered by the revisers 'necessary' in the Church of Christ.² Is not the true explanation just this, that while there is a close parallelism between the two offices for ordination, they have no such near resemblance with the office for consecration as would justify us in anticipating a parallelism of rubrics. The one is an occasional service, the others are regular. Even the entire structure of the offices is different, for not only the previous exhortation, on which the Dean relies, but the subsequent Litany is absent from the consecration of bishops, which consists only of the Communion Service with the sermon—not an exhortation—in the normal position. And if this consideration does not convince the Dean, we will put to him, in relation to the Caroline revisers, the same question which we have already put to him in relation to St. Ignatius. Two thousand Puritan ministers were ejected from their benefices on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662. If episcopal ordination is an indispensable preliminary to the lawful execution of office in the Church, then the ejection, painful as it was, was necessary and unavoidable. But if

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 332 n.

² Only, on Dean Lefroy's own showing, if there were no necessity for Episcopacy, it would surely be even more advisable to provide for a defence of its expediency, and we should expect a rubric 'There shall be a sermon or exhortation declaring the duty and office of such as come to be admitted Bishop, how expedient, although unnecessary, that Order is in the Church.'

Episcopacy is merely the most expedient among allowable methods of Church government, then what in the other case was sad necessity becomes dastardly and unjustifiable persecution. For our own part, we refuse to make our Church answerable for such action. It is Dean Lefroy who casts on our spiritual ancestors—on that *clerus Anglicanus* which was *stupor mundi*—the terrible and awful responsibility of perpetuating an unnecessary schism by an unnecessary cruelty.

Hitherto we have been dealing with the Dean of Norwich mainly in the capacity of historian and liturgiologist: we are probably not doing him an injustice when we say that his tastes and his bent are not primarily for scholarship. A scholar would scarcely translate the very ordinary and indefinite phrase *διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν*, 'on account of the work,' and again, 'because of work which in a definite sense was "theirs"':¹ and an accurate scholar could not possibly have passed such a set of careless accentuations as the following:—p. 117, n. 1, *ἐρχομενός, κυρίος*; n. 3, *αὐλισθη*; n. 5, *αὐτῆς*; p. 118, n. 2, *ψευδοπροφήται*; p. 119, n. 3, *τὸ θεῖον, τὸν ἄνθρωπον*; p. 123, n. 1, *ἄλλα τίνα* (for *ἄλλα τινὰ*), *δυσθεραπευτοῦς*; p. 128, n. 2, *καμίνω, ἀνυστερήτω οὔση*; p. 135, n. 1, *ἦν* (for *ἦν*); p. 137, n. 1, *ὀφείλουσιν, ἦ* (for *ἦ*); p. 140, n. 1, *χώρας, τῷ*; p. 141, n. 1, *τετάγμενοι*; p. 143, n. 1, *οἶνω, ἀνέγκλητοι, ὑποταγή*; p. 147, n. 1, *ἄπτονται*.

Questions of style admit of more variety of opinion than questions of scholarship. But that we are within the mark when we entitle the Dean's style 'luxuriant' the following quotation will amply suffice to show. The Dean is speaking of the evidence of St. Peter's First Epistle: ²

'That area includes Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. As we look at the territory thus described, the eye is led by the light of inspiration along the shores of the Euxine. It moves with gladdening hope and keen amazement over rushing river and mountain pass and winding valley, until it pauses in the city of Nicomedia. We pursue the broadening beams of spiritual illumination further still to the Bosphorus. We look around, and the glare of glory bathed the Churches of Galatia in its golden light. Here was a region in which history rises into the fascination of romance. . . . From Galatia we are led to Cappadocia, thence to proconsular Asia, with its seething life, its sickly pomp, its frightful pastimes, its laws, its idolatries, its pagan hierarchies.'

We are afraid that our readers will feel it somewhat of a bathos to learn that all this eloquence is only to prove that since St. Peter appeals to the elders or presbyters to feed the flock of God, presbyters must have existed when he wrote in

¹ *Christian Ministry*, p. 62 and note: 1 Thess. v. 12.

² *Ibid.* p. 79.

'Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.' For isolated flowers of style we may quote almost at random, 'a catena of perhapes,' 'a series of preachments' (he is speaking of the Apostles), 'the glaring addendum,' 'the labours of the ministry are subject to hemiplegia.'¹ And will the Dean take it ill of us if we urge him, before a second edition is called for, to read through his book, pen in hand, and ruthlessly to erase every single occurrence (there cannot be less than a century) of the irritating monosyllable 'Yea'?

Our task draws to a close. If the course of our investigations into a great and momentous question may have seemed scrappy and uneven, we venture to say that the blame must rest on the shoulders of the Dean of Norwich. His book cannot be ranked for a moment with either Mr. Gore's or Dr. Hatch's as a positive presentation of an intelligible conception, based on independent research and thorough treatment at first hand of the original authorities. His relation to Mr. Gore is simply that of a reviewer, and even looked at as a review his criticism is disjointed and disappointing. We can say with truth that we took up his work with the hope of finding much, and the intention of emphasizing all, with which we could agree; and indeed if he had confined himself to the first six of his eight chapters there would have been little to quarrel with and something to praise. But in the lengthy postscript of 200 pages he would seem entirely to have lost his bearings. It is only charitable to suppose that the conclusion was composed in special haste, in the midst of 'ceaseless demands and as ceaseless interruptions'² of the busy life of a Liverpool archdeacon and incumbent. No one who reads Dean Lefroy's book will fail to credit him with an honest desire and attempt to understand the position of brethren who disagree with him. And yet so distorted is the medium through which he views their simplest statements that to the end we are not clear whether he does not regard Mr. Gore as an unintentional 'Jesuit in disguise.' But if he would read the most suggestive and effective among modern 'apologies' for the theory of the Church of England against the theory of the Church of Rome, let him turn to Mr. Gore's brochure, *Roman Catholic Claims*, and when he is once convinced that its author is identical with the author of the *Ministry of the Christian Church* whom he has been criticizing, he will at least concede that Mr. Gore's attachment, and the attachment of those who agree with him, to our mother the Church of England is not less real and not less reasoned than his own.

¹ *Christian Ministry*, pp. 373, 131, 144, 263.

² *Ibid.*, p. xii.

ART. XI.—THE UNKNOWN GOD.

The Unknown God: or, Inspiration among Pre-Christian Races. By C. LORING BRACE. (London, 1890.)

THE story of Human Progress under Christianity was told in an interesting book by Mr. Brace in 1882,¹ which we are glad to see is now in its third edition. He has followed it by even a more ambitious work, with the object of showing 'what great truths have inspired the pious heathen of the past, and how far the influences of the Divine Spirit have reached remote and separated tribes of men and revealed to them the nature of God.' Ostensibly the book is neither 'a critical attack on the heathen religions' nor 'a defence of Christianity.' Indirectly this has been essayed, sufficiently for Mr. Brace, in his *Gesta Christi*; his last endeavour is 'to make manifest the ways of God to men in a field not hitherto much traversed' (*Pref.* p. ix). The Christian advocate has no quarrel in such a case; he is more than content to be judged by results,² though he does not believe with Paley 'that the qualities of actions depend entirely upon their effects.'³ Nor can our faith be shocked by learning anew what St. Peter taught plainly enough of old, that God 'left not Himself without witness.' Indeed, in a notice of Mr. Brace's earlier book, we expressly demurred to any disparagement of other creeds on behalf of Christianity,⁴ believing that we have no need of artificial shading by way of contrast to the Light of the World.

The plan of the work before us is to sketch the outlines of non-Christian systems—Egyptian, Akkadian, Greek, Persian, Indian—in several of their varieties. No less than three chapters are devoted to the Stoics, and two to the Buddhists; heathen inspiration is next considered, on the testimony of Jewish and Christian Scriptures; and lastly, in view of all these spiritual forces, we are encouraged to hope notwithstanding for the ultimate conversion of the world.

The vein of piety which ran through the pages of *Gesta Christi*, the evidence of which sharpened more than one

¹ Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xviii. No. 36, p. 345.

² Cf. Dr. Croslegh, *Christianity judged by its Fruits*, S.P.C.K. 1884.

³ Paley, *View of the Evidences of Christianity*, pt. ii. chap. ii. p. 207 (edition Birks, 12mo, 1848).

⁴ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xviii. p. 354.

hostile point of criticism against it, is equally traceable in the present volume; and will, we fear, discredit it to some extent on the ground of partiality, if not that of prejudice. But on neither book can there rest the least charge of ecclesiasticism; though, as far as we have seen, there is now a singular absence of protest against the Church, as distinguished in the author's mind from Christianity.

A comparison of religions, in any fair or dispassionate tone, is so much the product of modern thought that a conservative faith 'once delivered unto the saints' can hardly yet bear with it. And it is surely no reproof to theology if the caution of her most experienced sons should make them slow to change. Toleration of religious opponents is a new thing, however loveable and praiseworthy. For ages the bulwark of a man's belief—Christian or non-Christian—was an equally profound conviction of the falsehood of all opposing faiths. Christian and Mussulman alike called each other infidel; while for him whose religion was 'not of a book' there was simply neither mercy nor pity. It would be edifying even now to hear the mutually candid opinion—say of Hindu and Buddhist, Shiite and Parsee, the Orthodox Church and Islam. Professors of Comparative Religion might find after all, in the Christianity which some of them ignore, a freedom of speech and consideration for diverse opinion, not springing wholly from disdain. But beyond all this it were well for the advocates of Christianity to remember that there is a theology living as well as dead, true as well as false. Nor can the modern doubts and difficulties be solved by evasion: rather indeed are they caused oftentimes by unwise teachers.

It is not simply that books, magazines, and papers, more or less hostile to religion, are sown broadcast, and find their way into every home¹—though the recognition of this new factor of unbelief seems hardly present to the minds of all the clergy—but besides, an unlearned, unsympathetic, or unfair treatment of other faiths than ours, does harm to the Christian cause. It is an age of enquiry; eager, not of necessity contradictory; sceptical, though not in consequence antagonistic.

The opening chapter on Egyptian Monotheism will come as a surprise upon many readers familiar with the later developments of brute worship; and the pure cult of OSIRIS will further astonish others, in larger numbers, who have been taught to think the sublimest truths of God were revealed first and only to the sons of Shem. Great were the omens at

¹ Cf. Dupanloup's *Ministry of Preaching*, pt. iii.

the birth of Osiris, and they were more than fulfilled in the story of his life. No King like him went before him, and none arose after; his presence was a charm to all men, as he taught 'the good news of human brotherhood and devotion to God.' Opposition was stirred up against him by the Spirit of Evil, by whom he was defeated and killed. So ended on earth a short life of thirty years; but he rose again, became 'First of Mummies,' and was made judge of quick and dead in Amenti or the lower world. Another wonderful parallel may be seen in the doctrine of THOTH, the creating spirit or word—'Without Thoth is nothing made, and Thoth is God.'¹

The *Book of the Dead*, called somewhat rashly by Mr. Brace (p. 19) 'the most ancient of human documents,' is largely quoted in abundant evidence of his main contention. And unless we are prepared to believe in singularly fortunate guesswork, these conceptions of ancient Egypt are a fair proof of sensitiveness to unseen influences which became inspired with moral and spiritual truths from above. And, while freely granting this, the Christian reader will find an argument to his hand of no slight force in so plain a record of development downwards, paralleled only in its depths of degradation by the religions of India.

In his comparison of Egyptian and Jewish faith, Mr. Brace takes an unusual line of thought. For the most part, in similar books, a great deal is made of the alleged resemblances between the Hebrew and Egyptian systems. 'We know,' says Archdeacon Hardwick,² 'that during their abode in Egypt the majority of Hebrews proper . . . contracted more and more a fondness for Egyptian thoughts and customs, utterly at variance with the creed inherited from their fathers.' But Mr. Brace remarks with more sagacity:—'One of the singular facts of history is that a people like the Jews should have lived for so many years under the rule of a nation like the Egyptians, and have carried away after their emancipation *so few mental and religious influences*' (p. 41). The italics are ours. Probably Mr. Grant Allen, with the learning and fairness which distinguish him in theological matters, will regard this only as a fresh instance of Jewish barbarism; that under it the tribal fetish of JAHVEH—a stone smeared with the fat of countless offerings—should have been preferred to the pure worship of Isis

¹ See p. 9, n. 3, referring to Brugsch, *Religion &c. der alten Aegypter*, p. 58.

² *Christ and other Masters*. By Charles Hardwick. Second Edition, 1863, vol. ii. pt. iv. chap. ii. 'Alleged Affinities between the Hebrew and Egyptian Systems,' p. 310.

and Osiris. Great, indeed, as were the ritual resemblances of Hebrew and Egyptian, the doctrinal contrasts were greater—indeed, absolutely different in their fundamental treatment.¹ Moses, we are expressly told, was ‘learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians’; often he may have read on the pediment of the Temple of Isis ‘I am he that is, and was, and shall be,’ in forecast of the revelation on Mount Horeb, I-AM-THAT-I-AM. And if from childhood he had intercourse with the priestly caste, he knew something of their nobler esoteric doctrines: ‘Amid the multitudes of deities worshipped by the masses, the deifying of animals and reptiles, the disgusting superstitions into which the Egyptian religion had degenerated, he heard from these solitary thinkers of One, by name XOPER, who was before all, over all, and in all—the Self-existing, the All-beginning, the Source of all life and action, the Eternal, Immortal, and Invisible’ (p. 44).

A hardly less interesting account is given, from the latest investigations, of the primitive faith of Akkad. It is one of the four cities mentioned in Genesis x. 10 as ‘the beginning of the kingdom’ of Nimrod, and ‘out of that land went forth Asshur and builded Nineveh.’ Who and what these ancient people were, whether Semitic, Turanian, or mixed, is still an open question; but, however pure in blood they may have been in their original dwellings on the hills, the Akkadians (=‘mountaineers’) mingled with the tribes on the plains eastern and southern, and, if the dates given by Assyriologists may be relied on, were fairly civilized thirty centuries or more B.C. One of the earliest of their poems is an invocation to the ‘Seven Evil Powers’ of the world (p. 53). Another is a ‘Hymn to the Fire God’ who strives to overcome the Seven Spirits of Evil (p. 54). Nor is it incredible that in these utterances they followed the leading of the same divine purpose that ‘found in Chaldæa the elect Chaldee.’ A ray of the light which streamed upon him need not be denied to these hillsmen, who prayed in their penitential psalms, ‘Keep Thou the door of my lips,’ and confessed that their sins were ‘seven times seven.’ It is true that they held other and lower notions of God, with all their recognition of Him as supreme; but significantly in this again we see new proof of degradation. And beyond all doubt monotheism is clearly shown, whether learned by inspiration of God or intuition of man, in these

¹ Cf. Hardwick (ii. 343)—‘As every fundamental tenet of the Hebrew had been always diametrically at variance with the tenets of his Canaanitish neighbours, it will follow that, so long as he was true to his own principles, he stood in no more friendly attitude to the theology of Egypt.’

fragments of 'a poetic people in the valley of the Euphrates' akin to the family of Abraham : a somewhat earlier instance of faith in the One God than that which has been confidently assigned by Kuenen and others who maintain that the Jews were not monotheistic till the time of the Prophets (p. 73).

Passing on to Greek and Latin faiths we are struck with a certain inexactness, arising presumably not from want of care, but from the treatment by Mr. Brace of matters unfamiliar to him.¹ Careful perusal of his work leads to the suspicion that it is largely a collection of materials by different hands, marshalled by him with varied and unequal skill. The inaccuracies patent from time to time are not important enough to damage his main argument ; but they blemish its statement, even more than his fondness for adjectives disfigures his English—or shall we not call them American—periods. His work throughout is suggestive, rarely if ever exhaustive. Its conception is deserving of the highest praise ; fertility of invention, and originality indeed of any kind, are delightful in these days of compilation and repetition. But withal we are unable to resist a desire for more comprehensive treatment of these great matters on our author's own valuable lines. And, if we say this reluctantly of the work as a whole, specially must it be noted of the chapters on the Greek Mysteries, Zeus as Spiritual God, the Religion of Socrates and Plato, the Faith and Writings of the Stoics. Dr. Talbot in his admirable essay in *Lux Mundi*, on the 'Preparation in History for Christ,'² has traversed the same field, and may well be instanced as a contrast to Mr. Brace in most respects, if not all. But the latter does see felicitously the great defect of the Stoical system, 'the want of a personal model for the virtues inculcated' (p. 161). Pure Theism, at the best, was bare and cold, and the revelation—if any—was too unimpassioned and unsympathetic to move the hearts of men.

'Marcus Aurelius appeals to the life of Epictetus, and the latter recalls Socrates and his death. Seneca cites noble examples ; but in all the history of Stoicism there were scarcely any examples faultless and inspiring, and the best—that of Epictetus—was presented near the close of the history of this system. There was no single life, or personality, except his, in the eight hundred years of the history of Stoicism which could be considered even a partial revelation of the Divine Spirit. There was nothing about which the affection and veneration of the masses could cling' (p. 161).

¹ Cf. on p. 319, 'We too, O Thou *Theos Agnōstos*' (sic).

² *Lux Mundi*, pp. 129-178.

The order of Mr. Brace's book is not one of chronology; his chapters on the Stoics, and review of Greek and Latin faiths, being followed by treatises on the Eastern systems, beginning with Zoroastrianism. He does full justice to the Mazdean conception of righteousness 'as the moral foundation of the universe'; though we hardly believe that the Jewish doctrine of Satan, God's adversary, came entirely from this quarter. Rather 'in estimating this momentous question it is,' as Archdeacon Hardwick pointed out,¹ 'of the first importance to observe that any influences exerted on the Hebrews by the votaries of the Ormazd religion must have always, in the period of the exile, been extremely slender and was not indirect. The principal scene of transportation was *not* Persia Proper, and although the natives of some Median cities where those exiles were dispersed might then have been, in part at least, related ethnologically to their Perso-Aryan neighbours, the religion which prevailed in Media before the accession of Darius Hystaspis, and perhaps still later, was the element worship of the Scythic Magi—not the formal and elaborate dualism connected with the name of Zoroaster and proclaimed at large in the Avesta.' Mr. Brace thinks these beliefs 'may all rest on divine inspirations, partially understood, which were granted to many races' (p. 190). But the understanding must have been very slight indeed, if the revelation came at all from above, and not rather from the unaided wit of man, seeking to explain the contradictions of the world. Confessedly 'it could not satisfy the heart or intellect of mankind, and soon ended in gross superstitions' (p. 190). Clear and attractive as the dual system at first may appear—and it is not without adherents even in these days—the difficulties which it raises are more than those which it subdues; 'the theory leads to endless confusion and discouragement' (p. 294); and, reasoning backwards, it is impossible to conceive that it ever began in the counsel of the Most High; while 'at the very time of the highest bloom of the Mazdean dogma the Jews held firmly to the belief in a God Who had created all things and all beings, who had no equal, and no adversary other than He permitted' (p. 190). To argue otherwise and trace the beginnings of dualism to divine revelation, were a revival of the error with a vengeance, and a division of the mind of God. Inspiration may conceivably extend through all degrees, from the smallest whisper in the heart of a savage to the uncovering of the ear of Jehovah's servant; but it cannot be contradictory, nor differ

¹ *Christ and other Masters*, vol. ii. pt. iv. chap. iv. pp. 399-400.

in kind. 'God is not the author of confusion.' 'He cannot deny Himself.'

Far more fitly may we turn from Iranic to Indo-Aryan teaching, and find in it an echo of the One God. Quotations from the Rig-Veda are now so well known that there is little need of repetition; though at the best they are unequal pearls, and the Sanskrit scriptures will not on the whole satisfy a student who goes to them in belief that the familiar extracts are fair samples of abundant wisdom, truth, and beauty. And the course is downward always, from the Vedas to the Code of Manu, from it to the Puranas. Even the hymns in the Veda of Praise do not 'rise occasionally into pure monotheism' (207) so much as they rather fall away from it. If the date of these be fourteen centuries before Christ, all traces of inspiration vanish in the next five hundred years. The code of the ninth century is marked by a complete change of idea; God is no longer one and supreme, but Matter is held to be eternal. And from the egg of Brahma all subsequent creations, deities great and small, and herogods, are developed in a hopeless issue of degradation. And, after pleading faintly, in the face of these tremendous facts, for some recognition of the Unknown God by the highest thinkers of India, Mr. Brace sadly allows that 'no other history and no human experience is so clear a proof of the practical curse to a people which lies in a false philosophy and imperfect religion as the confused records of Hindu thought afford. The combination of pantheism and idolatry seems to be the worst possible spiritual atmosphere for a people' (p. 222).¹

Buddhism, the creed of millions, claimed by some writers as the faith of the majority, is reviewed with more admiration in chapters xiv.-xvi. Mr. Brace's conclusion, nevertheless, may be commended to those who see in the system a rival to Christianity, a solvent to the riddles of the world. 'The want of a direct faith in God as Father, and of sure hope in life eternal, has doomed it to final extinction. Despite its noble morality and its divine compassion it must pass away' (p. 298). The Unknown God is held to be 'there, for "God is Love," but not through a revelation sufficiently clear, or an inspiration so overpowering, as to lead humanity through its long and weary wanderings in coming ages' (*ibid.*). Happily a denial of God's existence does not disprove it; but only in sublime unconsciousness can the Buddhist doctrines be held in sup-

¹ And so, in a further review, on p. 295: 'Nothing in the moral results of misdirected religion can ever equal in horror and sensuality the effects of pantheism, materialized by idolatry.'

port
Budd
the i
the s
nihil
Budd
form
scint
Budd
Hind
Budd
few
than
the m
accu
is ne
even
Law
adhe
to an
know
this
und
it wa

... t
sour
doctr
religi
goal
will
ism,
it inc
caus
spirit

prai
dhis
yield

Punc

at Se
the c
Budd

port of revelation. 'To Brahmins God is everything; to Buddhists God is nothing.' If the Buddhist broke away from the ideal pantheism of the Brahman he found 'no refuge in the sanctuary of truth,' his creed was 'purely negative and nihilistic.'¹ Distinction must be made in fairness between Buddhism as a philosophy and as a religion, for though in the former it ignores God, in the latter it worships countless gods, scintillations of the divine light, beings from which the future Buddhas will arise.² And again we should remember that Hinduism may be theistic, pantheistic, or atheistic; but Buddhism is of necessity only the latter: its theistic schools, few and far between, being rather a return to Brahmanism than a variety of the rival system. Gathered for ages under the name of Buddha, an overwhelming pile of literature has accumulated, stupefying to the Western mind, and a lifetime is needful to pass beyond the portals of its doctrine, to read even the Tripitikas, or reflect properly upon the Wheel of the Law. But esoteric Buddhism is not what many of its modern adherents imagine, nor can its teaching be reasonably assigned to any inspiration from above; God to it is not simply unknown and unknowable but non-existent. It may help us in this matter to call a witness who cannot be charged with any undue preference to Christianity, and the revelation by which it was declared.

'Buddhism and Christianity have no relationship to each other . . . they are not even kindred religions . . . *they spring from different sources.* Christianity has its roots in Semitic Monotheism, and the doctrines it inherits from Judaism make it necessarily a supernatural religion, because these doctrines put the cause, the direction, and the goal of the Higher Life outside of the sphere where the mind and will of man have power. Buddhism has its roots in Aryan Pantheism, and the fundamental doctrines it inherits from Brahmanism leave it independent of supernaturalism, because these doctrines make the cause, the direction, and the goal of the Higher Life belong to the spirit that animates and moves the soul in man.'³

This witness is true; and although Mr. Brace may well praise the 'elevated morality . . . and benevolence' of Buddhism as displayed in its earlier and best fields, we could not yield to it the honour of inspiration except in the vaguest

¹ Hardwick, *ibid.* vol. i. pt. ii. chap. i. p. 229.

² Article on 'Buddhism' in *Mission Life*, November 1879, by Dr. Punchard, p. 167.

³ *Religious Systems of the World*, a collection of addresses delivered at South Place Institute in 1888-9. 'Buddha and Buddhism,' p. 133. See the essay throughout, and cp. 'Buddhism in Christianity' and 'Esoteric Buddhism.'

sense of the term. It deliberately shut the door of access to God, although so far as it regarded man it may be finely called a 'compassion seeking to save' (p. 297). Few missions, indeed, have been loftier than that of Sakya Muni; few men have lived a nobler life of self-denial for the sake of their fellow creatures; and Christians have no lack of saintly memories of their own that they should scruple to acknowledge whatever of good is to be found elsewhere. The work of Gautama was a real blessing to India, and in his lovely lessons of duty, kindness, and forgiveness he truly 'spread a spirit of charity abroad, which encompassed the lowest life as well as the highest.'¹ But the essay to which we have already referred² speaks frankly of the popular blunder which supposes 'that in Buddha we have an Indian Christ.' He professed no knowledge of the Divine Powers, no support from them, no inspired lesson for mankind. He did not 'proclaim himself a Saviour willing and able to take upon his shoulders the sins of the whole world.' So far from this he declared 'that no god even could do for any man that work of self-conquest and self-emancipation' which in his religion 'stands for salvation.' In the *Dhammapada*, quoted largely and favourably by Mr. Brace in support of his views, there is little sign of an objective faith, and none of help from the unseen. 'By oneself the evil is done, by oneself one suffers. By oneself evil is left undone, by oneself one is purified. Purity and innocence belong to oneself, no one can purify another.' And, again, 'Buddhism is the one religion that bids man trust himself, that calls upon him to raise himself by his own strength . . . that assures him there is no strength outside to help him.'³ Poor consolation this, far removed from the faintest recollection of God, and the informing of His Word. 'The ideals of sympathy, purity, and justice' cherished by Gautama and the noblest of his followers may well have been 'the expressions of a supernatural influence' though unrecognized by them as such, and by the very nature of their creed forbidden for ever to be so interpreted. But this 'divine inspiration from the Unknown God' (p. 254) has been singularly misused; and, apart from higher questions of the unseen world, the actual result in the lives of modern Buddhists is sadly evident.⁴ We are not quite sure that Mr. Brace

¹ Cf. *Mission Life*, *ubi sup.* p. 167.

² 'Buddha and Buddhism,' in *Religious Systems of the World*, pp. 133-4.

³ *Ibid.* p. 135.

⁴ Cf. an Introduction to the *Lalita Vistara*, the eighth of the pre-

consi
we r
little
Tart
of th
B.C.
ligio
whor
achie
in th
quic
peni
Hinc
Sing
tong
win
may
the p
cann
seen
worl
the s
a pa
write
book
verse

thou
one
cred
Hinc
cons
erran
incas
Mith
cast,
othe
Pers
thre
conf

emin
Mitra
1
3
cepti
p. 19

considers Buddhism an Aryan faith; it is rather Turanian, if we may still use so indefinite a term. Begun in Sakya's little patrimony to the north of Oudh, among a people largely Tartar by descent, it spread far and wide beneath the favour of the Mauryan princes of Magada, until in the third century B.C. King Asoka established the new creed as the State religion. His dynasty was Sudra by caste, and the Nagas whom he displaced were scarcely Indian at all. Buddhism achieved no lasting triumph with the more intelligent races in the home of its birth; Aryans and semi-Aryans returned quickly to Hinduism, and it is doubtful whether in all the peninsula there are now to be found any Buddhists purely Hindi. Even in Ceylon, where the faith is most popular, the Singhalese are non-Aryan, though they speak an Aryan tongue. And this failure of a supremely atheistic creed to win for itself any following among the higher classes of men may be noted still further in the stagnation, if no worse, of the peoples who own its sway. 'The invisible things of God' cannot be apprehended by the Buddhist, much less 'clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made'; for this world, and all that is in it, natural or supernatural, 'belong to the sphere of Maya illusion, that the enlightened know to be a passing and deceiving dream.'¹ Our thanks are due to a writer who speaks so plainly, in striking contrast to specious books of comparative religion, Oriental fable, and romantic verse.

But no small dilemma concerning all this besets the thoughtful mind, and we do not disguise it. Buddhism, in one or other of its countless forms, has been for ages 'an incredible satisfaction to many millions of human beings.' Hinduism again, with its extraordinary vitality and unique conservative power, drawing back to its bosom many an errant sect, and claiming even Buddha himself as the ninth incarnation of Vishnu. Nor can we omit the mention of Mithraism² with its ceaseless charm for minds of a mystical cast, affecting not only the religion from which it sprang, but others far removed in space and time; the older faiths of Persia, Assyria, Chaldæa, and Phœnicia; of Egypt in at least three stages of glory and decay. What can be said of the confusion of tongues and perplexity of doctrine involved in eminently holy books of the Nepaulese Buddhists, by Rajendra La La Mitra, p. 12 *et seq.*

¹ 'Buddha and Buddhism,' *ubi sup.* p. 145.

² 'It is certainly remarkable that the purest religion of antiquity (excepting the Jewish) should have almost perished from the earth' (Brace, p. 197).

them all? The question is not simply why did these manifestations of good arise in the world, but further why, in creed after creed, should the better part of them languish and die?

If we follow one line of explanation, and that which is mostly favoured by modern opinion, it is pessimist in the extreme; the clouds of Oriental sadness have gathered towards the West, and the riddle of the world has no solution. Its record is one of failure, of 'hopes slain in the advent of the morn.' Man began his toilsome pilgrimage in warfare with gigantic brutes early in the Pleistocene. Not in a garden of Eden, wherein was 'every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, the tree of life also in the midst,' but in strife with natural forces hard to understand, deaf moreover to entreaty. Little by little, in correspondence with his terrible environment, he rose from the depths; the inarticulate murmur of the beast within him changed to a human cry; but suffering deepened with capacity for pain, and none may solve its mystery. The 'heir of all the ages' is born to an inheritance of sorrow. He may lift his trembling hands in ineffectual prayer, but the heaven is as brass above him, and 'there is neither voice nor any to answer, nor any that regardeth.' The gloomy creed of Calvin was surely bright in comparison with this, for destiny there was shaped by intelligence, and above all we felt the sovereignty of God; but here truly we are left 'without God and without hope in the world.' The 'intuitions and revelations' of which Mr. Brace writes so eloquently were valueless, idle as the wind; memories of a past which had never been, promises of a future which could never be.

Happily for mankind there is still another explanation, that of Christianity. It has no 'cut and dried answer to all objections,' nor condemnation of earnest men who make them. But in the face of all contradiction and denial

'it teaches still that God is the eternally existent One, the Being on Whom we depend, and in Whom we live, the source of all reality and the goal to which Creation moves, the Object alike of religion and philosophy, the eternal Energy of the natural world, and the immanent reason of the universe. It teaches that He is the eternally Righteous One, and therefore the Judge of all, irrevocably on the side of right, leading the world by a progressive preparation for the Revelation of Himself as Infinite Love in the Incarnation of the Word, stimulating those desires which He alone can satisfy, the yearning of the heart for love, of the moral nature for righteousness, of the speculative reason for truth.'¹

¹ Aubrey Moore on 'The Christian Doctrine of God' (*Lux Mundi*, p. 102).

Here, too, we think is an answer to the question, 'why the faith of a humble and despised tribe like the Hebrews still rules, in its higher and later form, the civilized world' (p. 170) while mythologies have passed away. It were only the sign of superficial knowledge, and the mark of an earlier and intolerant age, to see in those religions nothing but evil, and to say of their resemblances to Christianity what the Jesuit missionaries said of the Buddhist rites, that Satan invented them for mockery and derision. 'Canst thou by searching find out God' was the painful question of Job (xi. 7), and the negative answer of despair can only be heard by Christian ears with sympathy, and a desire to point out the way of life. We do not deny the elementary excellence of the non-Christian systems. Whatever of truth inspired them presumably came from God, known or unknown, for all good, human or divine, is attributed to Him alone.

In a special chapter (xvii.) Mr. Brace considers more minutely the conditions and extent of heathen inspiration. He believes firmly that the Light from God 'has visited every human being, of whatever race, or creed, or rank' (p. 300), while he sorrowfully allows that the world, as a whole, did not receive it, even when manifested most of all in Christ. But wherever any nations or individuals were receptive to this spiritual influence, there it stayed, guiding them towards, if not into, all truth. This inspiration is defined 'as a supernatural elevation of the moral and spiritual faculties; not, except indirectly, a strengthening of the judgment or wisdom or intellect, but a power given to see moral truth more distinctly and better to know God' (p. 301). And as he further thinks all peoples in this corporate capacity have been thus visited by the Spirit of God, so he would have each human being recall from his own experience 'moments when sudden and grand visions of truth, not to be accounted for by any apparent causes, burst upon his mind' (*ibid.*). No doubt such things occur to many men at certain periods of life, in the rush of passion, or the sudden call for noble effort; but the universality of such emotion is more than we can substantiate, and a colder reckoning must, we fear, displace enthusiasm on so large a scale. But when these influences come, as apart from question they have come and do come, in a course beyond our forecast, and with results which defy all tabulation, we agree with our author as he more cautiously says of them, they 'may be Divine inspirations, perhaps not miraculous, but from the ever-acting Spirit of God, working through the laws of the human soul' (p. 301). It is no part of theology, nor

science of this later day, to contradict His presence and immanence in the world.¹ But God's revelation to the heathen was not because nor by means of their own gods, rather in spite of them; sometimes to the bewilderment, we may think, of the soothsayers. The oracle in such a case would, all the same, be attributed to the deity consulted; it could not possibly be referred to the True God. Even the great prophecy of Isaiah concerning Cyrus redounded to the credit of the Babylonian Merodach, although its record, authenticated by time and place of utterance, was preserved by the Jews.² Nor can we accept another assertion put forward by Mr. Brace, that the Apostles 'acknowledged those who worshipped under heathen names as true believers in God' (p. 302).³ The very sermon preached by St. Paul in the Areopagus, from words which form the title of this book, declared Him who was '*ignorantly worshipped*' by the men of Athens. It was not a eulogy of pagan rite or creed. 'An idol,' wrote he word to the Corinthians (1 Cor. viii. 4-5), 'is nothing in the world: there is none other God but one, though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth.' So he told the Galatians (iv. 8), they had been in bondage τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς, a phrase hardly less strong than that of the *Didache*, λατρεία θεῶν νεκρῶν.⁴ Our Authorized Version of 'too superstitious' certainly misses the finer sense of δεισιδαιμονεστέρους;⁵ but although the Apostle to the Gentiles was longing to make clear 'a higher spirituality and more perfect humanity than even the greatest Stoics had known,' and could quote with taste and feeling what Aratus and Cleanthes had written of Zeus, we cannot think 'for the moment Zeus represented to him the idea of God.' St. Paul's spirit had been stirred within him as he gazed upon that city, κατεῖδων—matchless in wisdom and beauty—and what sympathy he

¹ Cf. 'Darwinism and the Christian Faith,' fourth essay in *Science and the Faith*, by the late A. L. Moore, pp. 162-221.

² Cf. Isaiah xlv. 1-5, and Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, p. 156: 'Merodach beheld with joy the deeds of his vicegerent, who was righteous in hand and heart. Merodach has in goodness drawn nigh to him, made strong his name.'

³ We are further pointed to St. Paul's experience at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1-4). The reference can scarcely have been made after due consideration of the Greek, ἐλάβετε . . . ἡκούσαμεν, though the English version (A. V. not R. V.) gives some colour to the statement.

⁴ Διδαχὴ τῶν ἁγ. vi. 3. Et cf. iii. 4: μὴ γίνου οἰνωσκόπος· ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν εἰδωλολατρίαν μὴδὲ ἐπασιδὸς μὴδὲ μαθηματικὸς μὴδὲ περικαβαίρων, μὴδὲ θέλε αὐτὰ βλέπειν· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἀπάντων εἰδωλολατρία γεννᾶται.

⁵ Though surely better thus than '*somewhat religious*'! R. V. Acts xvii. 22.

had
of a
him
but
devo
Athe
truth
ador
or ex
A
far
will
fulne
right
Chris
he ma
and
pure
all m
offsp
paren
as mi
mona
has
legiti
is far
to the
recom
Chris
they
the F
only
sough
for ou
by the
No le
branch
and lo
the L
T
Christ
exultin
now be
and sin
B
chap. i
VOL

had for its ideas of worship, which extended towards an altar of an Unknown God, could hardly have been absent from him with regard to the countless shrines of divinities Named, but none the less Unknown. It was that nameless altar of devotion which gave him the pretext of setting forth to the Athenians a strange new God, not of declaring the hidden truth of the 'Spiritual Zeus, the God of their poets, the Being adored in the secret worship of the Mysteries' (cf. pp. 304-5), or expressed in symbols and statues around.

A further question arises in the mind of our author how far 'we can reasonably expect this inspiration of the heathen will culminate in Christianity' (chap. xviii.). And his hopefulness on this point is not to be gainsaid. But while he rightly considers 'the one great obstacle to the spread of Christianity in the world is the lives of its professors' (p. 309) he maintains that the best counteracting argument is 'the sight and experience of the best fruit of the teachings of Jesus—a pure family life in a Christian home.' To which end, presumably, all missionaries should be married, and further blessed with offspring—sufficient in number to call forth on the part of their parents virtues which may captivate the heathen.¹ Then follows, as might be expected, a solemn condemnation of celibate and monastic establishments; in forgetfulness of what their work has been in the past, and that they themselves were the legitimate outcome of an Oriental and ascetic religion.² There is far more force in an appeal for unity (p. 311) and a reproach to the Church for its unhappy divisions, and best of all, in a recommendation to 'Christian orators' when addressing non-Christian audiences, to stand fast, 'as St. Paul did' on what they alike believe (p. 312). It were idle to preach faith to the Hindu, whose whole capacity is exercised therein; his only want is the proper Object for which through ages he has sought in vain, the true Avatara of Him 'who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, and was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made Man.' No less fruitless must it be to denounce Buddhism, root and branch, because of modern depravity; far wiser 'in the Spirit and love of Buddha' (p. 316) to offer a better Redeemer, even the Lord Christ; the strivings of whose gentle Spirit were

¹ The oddity of this opinion may be compared with one in *Gesta Christi* (*Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xviii. No. 36, p. 353), where, in exulting over the emancipation of women, Mr. Brace says: 'Women are now being appointed for the State Boards of Charity, the School Boards, and similar important public organizations' (p. 297).

² But this is only a light echo of their condemnation in *Gesta Christi*, chap. iv. pp. 32-33.

surely with Sakya Muni long ago. He truly was a 'Light of Asia,' but greater than he is 'the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' Annihilation and absorption, the dilemma of Eastern thought, on which its 'two great manifestations of religious influences' are impaled, can neither of them be traced to a Word of God; indeed, were they so deducible, the Godhead from which they came would be discredited, and in self-contradiction destroyed. But these are not of the essence of primæval teaching, and, behind all accretions of myth and doctrine, the missionary of Christ may appeal to the earlier workings of the Spirit of God. Wisdom is justified of all her children.¹ Not merely the blessed few, prophet and lawgiver and saint, to whom have been vouchsafed a special revelation; nor even the favoured nations, Jewish or Christian, who have been preserved, guided, strengthened, and enlightened through many a shifting scene of prosperity and adversity, probations alike in this imperfect state. But beyond these 'the peoples that walked in darkness, that dwelt in the land of the shadow'; for upon them too 'hath the light shined.'² Under its heavenly glow are 'sweet and unknown virtues . . . little acts of disinterestedness, pure aspirations, heroic deeds of quiet life, sweet affections, humble prayers, the unseen patience under suffering, the faithfulness which no dangers could shake, and the love which the waters of death could not quench—all that is best in human life and which no historian or poet has ever recorded' (p. 317).

The light was often 'shining in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not';³ but surely it was given that all nations 'should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being.'⁴

¹ St. Matthew xi. 19.

³ St. John i. 5.

² Isaiah ix. 2.

⁴ Acts xvii. 22-31.

ART. XII.—MR. R. L. STEVENSON'S NOVELS.

1. *New Arabian Nights*. (London, 1882.)
2. *Treasure Island*. (London, 1883.)
3. *Prince Otto*. (London, 1885.)
4. *The Dynamiter*. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON and FANNY VAN DE GRIFT STEVENSON. (London, 1885.)
5. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. (London, 1886.)
6. *Kidnapped*. (London, 1886.)
7. *The Merry Men, and other Tales and Fables*. (London, 1887.)
8. *The Black Arrow*. (London, 1888.)
9. *The Wrong Box*. By R. L. STEVENSON and LLOYD OSBOURNE. (London, 1889.)
10. *The Master of Ballantrae*. (London, 1889.)

It is an interesting exercise for a student of literature to attempt occasionally to form an estimate of an author whose work, however popular and notable it may be at the moment, has not yet stood the test of time or received the certificate of enduring excellence which posterity alone can give. It is an interesting exercise, but it is a venturesome one. The qualities which secure immediate success are not always those which conduce to permanent popularity, and, on the other hand, a man may have the gifts, or some of them, which are the special possession of the immortals, and yet not have them to a sufficient extent to secure for him a place in their number. Anyone that has been acquainted with English fiction for a dozen years can look back to at least half that number of novels which have made a great name for themselves, and which were received as notable additions to the literature of our country. Where are they now? Will our grandchildren read them, or any of them, in the years to come? Will they know even the names of them, the names which have been on the lips of everyone during the past decade—*John Inglesant*, *Democracy*, *Treasure Island*, *King Solomon's Mines*, *Robert Elsmere*? One of these is dead already; no one thinks now of *Democracy*. Two are dying, nor do we suppose that anyone expects their authors to leave a permanent mark upon English literature. *John Inglesant*, with much that was of only temporary interest, and appealing as it did in a great measure to a transitory phase of thought, has also considerable literary merits which may secure for it a moderate amount of

continued vitality. But only of the author who first won general recognition by the publication of *Treasure Island* can it be said that people look to him with some hope that he may take a permanent place in the records of the novelists of this present age. What is the ground of this hope, and what is the prospect that it may be realized?

It is indeed difficult to apply the standards of literary criticism to the work of a contemporary writer. An author may win, and deservedly win, great popularity by an able treatment of the questions which are exciting the chief contemporary interest; but if that is the sole merit of his work it must inevitably disappear with the advent of other times and other interests. This is especially the case with controversial works, and with novels which, like *Robert Elsmere*, depend chiefly for their interest upon controversial matters. A historian represents ably and faithfully the point of view of the best historical insight and research in his day; but other men will stand upon his shoulders and take his place with the readers of a subsequent generation or century. With novelists especially it is easily intelligible that the favourite of to-day will be found tedious to-morrow. They, more than any other class of writers, are dependent on ephemeral sources of interest. They represent the thoughts, the manners, the language of one particular period, which are not the thoughts, manners, or language of the periods which succeed. Even the greatest of them suffer to some extent from this cause. The heroes and heroines of Richardson and Miss Burney talk in language which to us it appears wildly impossible that reasonable persons should ever have employed; and there are some, we fear, who experience a like impression even from the writings of Miss Austen and Sir Walter Scott. Each succeeding generation adds something to the load which, through no fault of his own, hampers the novelist of the past. For the antiquarian he remains always as a valuable witness to the manners and customs of a bygone age; but he must possess genius of a high order, and appeal to something more than temporary interests if he is to be a living power with the readers of the century which succeeds his own. The fame of a poet of the first rank does not appreciably alter after his position has been once secured. Spenser and Milton stand to-day where they stood when the century began, and where they will stand when the twentieth century is drawing in turn to its close; but by that time will not Thackeray and Dickens be as Fielding and Smollett are now—read by the literary few, not by the reading many? Shakespeare will be read not

less, if the English language remains, when another three hundred years have passed since he took his place at the head of the literature of the world. Can the same be said even of Sir Walter Scott?

Therefore, in a sense, the novelist's duty is done if he has appealed successfully to the audience he is immediately addressing, or at least if he has retained his hold on the generation with whose thoughts and language he is directly in touch. But there is a real, if qualified, immortality which the greater novelists of past generations have won; and if the time is yet too short since the birth of the English novel, in anything approaching its present form, to determine how long a novelist's reputation can continue, still it is no small thing to be as Fielding or Richardson, as Jane Austen or George Eliot, as Thackeray, or Dickens, or Scott. Is there any possibility that the author of the works whose names stand at the head of this article will hold a place among or near such names as these, or will his reputation fade even with the generation that is growing up while he is writing? What are the qualities which have given him success, and are they such as to secure for him an honourable place in the estimate of the generations which are yet to come?

It is only of comparatively recent years that Mr. Stevenson has taken the high place which he would be universally allowed to hold among the novelists of the present day, but his first appearance in literature dates back to a somewhat earlier period. Long ago the observant had been attracted by the originality and literary grace of *Virginibus Puerisque*, and fascinated by the quaint narrative of the *Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes*. From these Mr. Stevenson passed, eight years ago, into the realm of fiction by the publication of the *New Arabian Nights*; but it was the appearance of *Treasure Island* in 1883 which first made his reputation with the general public. The first volume contained evidence of one of his most characteristic qualities, his delight in fanciful extravagance of story, a graceful playing with his subject which interests and amuses the reader without rousing his excitement or sympathy to any painful extent. The second showed his power of constructing a thrilling narrative and of giving life and reality to the language and actions of the characters created by his imagination. The success of *Treasure Island* was followed by an experiment of a very different kind, which occasioned great searchings of heart and much perplexity among Mr. Stevenson's new-found admirers. *Treasure Island* was a genuine, straightforward, exciting story, which

men sat up all night to finish and could understand from title page to conclusion ; but in *Prince Otto* they were never sure how far the author was serious, which of the principal characters they ought to sympathize with, or what was the ultimate drift of the history. It appeared as if it ought to have a moral, but what was it? Or was the author laughing in his sleeve at their efforts to find a moral or understand its meaning? Looking back on it from a greater distance of time, it appears that the book was written largely under the influence of Mr. Stevenson's half-serious, half-dilettante fancy. It is partly a genuine study of character, but the author has a slightly cynical and patronizing manner with his puppets, which makes it difficult for the reader to take them quite in earnest. The conflict of these two sides of Mr. Stevenson's genius prevents the book from being entirely satisfactory, but it remains a very pleasing and readable work if you take it in the right spirit.

In *The Dynamiter*, which appeared in the same year as *Prince Otto*, we are back again in the world of the *New Arabian Nights*, with, if possible, an increased extravagance of fancy. *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, with a story not less creditable to the inventive powers of its author, had a far more serious purpose and ranks very high among the shorter works of Mr. Stevenson. Imagination was added to fancy, and pathos and genuine interest attached to the story, together with the suggestion of a psychological problem of no common character. This was followed by *Kidnapped*, a story more in the manner of *Treasure Island*, with less of stirring incident and adventure, but with an even finer imagination of character and an almost perfect command of description and narrative. The general drift and the Scotch setting of the story inevitably recalled *Rob Roy*, and the comparison, though unequal, was not crushing. The book had not the same universal popularity as *Treasure Island*, but it will be generally recognized as containing work of a higher order of genius and as being perhaps the best thing that Mr. Stevenson has yet done.

His next volume, the collection of shorter stories entitled *The Merry Men*, might be taken as the most representative of the various sides of his genius of all the works that he has published. The tale from which the volume takes its name contains the finest of Mr. Stevenson's descriptions of the scenery of coast and sea, while the narrative exhibits his power of arousing and sustaining interest alike in the incidents and the study of character. 'Thrawn Janet' is another picture of Scotch character, a weird and ghastly little story,

this time entirely in dialect. 'Markheim' is a masterly study in psychology, executed with great perfection of literary workmanship and worthy to take its place by the side of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. These are the most striking of the six stories of which the volume is composed; but in 'Olalla' Mr. Stevenson has given us a pretty and pathetic tale in Spanish scenery, and in 'Will o' the Mill' a very pleasing half-fable, half-story; while 'The Treasure of Franchard' recalls the quieter among the narratives of the *New Arabian Nights*. The volume as a whole appears to be less generally known than it should be; but it has only to be read to be welcomed by all who appreciate graceful and effective story-telling combined with finished literary workmanship. Mr. Stevenson's remaining novels are of too recent date to require any lengthened description in order to recall them to the reader's memory. *The Black Arrow* is the least successful of his volumes of pure narrative, and seems to show, in its accumulation of sensational adventures and hair-breadth escapes, traces of its origin in the pages of a periodical paper; in spite of which, its picture of a portion of the struggle between York and Lancaster is of no mean interest, and touches on a part of our history which has not been much used as yet for the purposes of romance. In *The Wrong Box*, written in collaboration with a younger author, Mr. Stevenson must have given the extravagance of his fancy full play. It is a pure farce, very amusing of its kind, but with no pretence to any higher position in the world of literature. *The Master of Ballantrae* is a much more serious production and bears more signs of labour than any of his other novels. It is a careful and minute study of character on a somewhat limited scale, with a very sufficient setting of narrative, in which, however, the incidents are strictly subordinated to the delineation of character. It is a fine and powerful work, though hardly a pleasing one, from the unrelieved shade of melancholy and crime which hangs over the story and deepens as it approaches its close; and it may be questioned whether the psychological introspection has not to some extent hampered and interfered with the creative imagination which was so evident in *Kidnapped*. So far it is the last of Mr. Stevenson's works of fiction, and it closes the record on which we have to base the estimate of his genius which can be given at this stage in his career.

It will be seen from this summary of Mr. Stevenson's writings that they are not all of one character, and that his genius has more than one side to it. One main line of division between them might be indicated by classing them

under works of imagination and works of fancy. The distinction between imagination and fancy cannot, indeed, be drawn with scientific accuracy, but there need be no difficulty in recognizing the broad difference between the more serious and the lighter gift. No doubt in some of the writings now in question these qualities are combined. One may recognize something beyond mere fancy in the *Story of François Villon*, and something less than the highest imagination in parts of *Treasure Island*; but in the main the distinction is real, and no one will fail to place *The Suicide Club*, *The Rajah's Diamond*, *The Dynamiter*, and *The Treasure of Franchard* on one side of the line, and *Kidnapped*, *The Merry Men*, *Markheim*, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, and *The Master of Ballantrae* on the other. The former belong to a somewhat dilettante manner of story-telling, which has its counterpart in some features of Mr. Stevenson's literary style. In both manifestations this characteristic is far from being unpleasing, and has a delicate flavour of originality; but it is not the stuff out of which great and enduring works of art are made, and it does not exhibit the full strength of Mr. Stevenson's genius.

Another distinction still remains to be drawn. In *Treasure Island* and *Kidnapped* Mr. Stevenson is essentially a story-teller. In *Markheim* and much of *Prince Otto* he is primarily a psychologist. In *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and in *The Master of Ballantrae* he is both. He appears to take equal pleasure in the construction of a thrilling narrative and in the deliberate analysis of character. In this respect he represents two distinct phases of the literary taste of the present day—the phase which has produced Mr. Rider Haggard and the phase which has produced Mr. George Meredith; and it is not surprising that his alternate appearance in these different characters has proved a stumbling-block to many of the patrons of circulating libraries. *Prince Otto* was a terribly difficult nut for the devotees of *Treasure Island* to crack; and the successive appearance of stories in such different styles as *The Dynamiter*, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, *Kidnapped*, and the tales composing the volume of *The Merry Men* produced a general impression among this class of critics with respect to their author that you never knew where to have him, and that seeing that he was a person as to whom it might credibly be suspected that more was sometimes meant than meets the ear, it was well to be cautious in expressing an opinion about him.

It may, however, be asked, In which of these various

man
it is
is s
chol
wate
liter
hanc
both
no
Men
Stev
mus
anal
Eve
cons
whic
to fe
the
ract
stud
inter
caus
seve
The
sugg
sing
mon
delib
the
as a
the
the
inter
truth
but
a liv
elab
that
Scot
grea
to s
secti
fash
plea
actin

manifestations is Mr. Stevenson's genius best displayed? and it is a question which may give us pause for a moment. There is something very fascinating in an elaborate study of psychology. It is like the interest which a medical student takes in watching a neat dissection by a skilful anatomist. All lovers of literature are familiar with the interest it assumes in the master hand of Browning, and there are many disciples of this school both in poetry and in fiction. In the latter sphere there is no greater master of the art now living than Mr. George Meredith, of whom Mr. Henry James has told us that Mr. Stevenson is a warm admirer. In his works every nerve and muscle and vein is laid bare, every motive and every emotion analysed; and very interesting and instructive are the results. Even in a work like *The Egoist*, which many of his admirers consider, with some reason, to be one of his weakest, and in which there is even less action than usual, it is impossible not to feel one's interest aroused and sustained as one follows the elaborate and pitiless dissection of the principal characters. Mr. Stevenson has attempted no such extensive study of psychology as this; but one can imagine his interest in Mr. Meredith's methods to have been one of the causes contributing to the composition of *Prince Otto*, and several of his shorter stories belong to this class of fiction. The centre of interest in *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is the suggestion of a psychological fancy; and *Markheim* is a singularly fascinating study of the springs of action at a moment of supreme crisis. But, interesting as it is, one cannot deliberately maintain that psychology is the main business of the novelist. The painter must have made a study of anatomy as a preliminary, but we do not want him to exhibit to us all the bones and arteries of the figures which he represents. In the same way a novelist's presentation of characters in their interaction with one another gains very greatly in force and truth from a knowledge, intuitive or studied, of psychology; but here, as elsewhere, *ars est celare artem*. The creation of a living character requires a far greater genius than the most elaborate psychological analysis, and it is for this reason that we rate Shakespeare above Browning as a dramatist and Scott above Mr. Meredith as a novelist. Mr. Stevenson has great gifts in both directions, but it would be a pity if he were to sacrifice the creative power for the anatomical. Moral dissection has many charms; it is highly interesting, it is fashionable, and skill in it is easy to recognize; whereas the pleasure which we take in the representation of living and acting character is harder to analyse, and there is danger of

not distinguishing interest in a well-told story from interest in the delineation of its characters. But the latter is the higher gift: we want men, not anatomical studies; and for this reason we rank *Kidnapped* above *Prince Otto* as a representation of Mr. Stevenson's genius. Mr. Stevenson need not be afraid of following in the footsteps of his great compatriot Sir Walter Scott. There is no shame in making a story exciting, provided the characters composing it are living men and women of flesh and blood.

So much, then, for the general character of Mr. Stevenson's romances; but what are the special qualities and merits to which he owes his present position in the world of letters and his claim, if he has one, to a permanent place in our literature? The merits by which other novelists have earned their reputation are very various, and no single writer could combine them all. A long list might be made of qualities to which Mr. Stevenson makes no claim, and which yet have gained for their possessors a rank among the highest. He makes no pretension to rival Thackeray's delineation of high life with its satire, or Dickens's representation of low life with its caricature. He has not attempted the field of trivial domestic incident and uneventful commonplace life, in which Miss Austen reigns supreme and has for her distant followers Mr. Howells and Mr. James. He has not the profound interest in morality, and in the tragedy that may involve the life of common men, which distinguishes George Eliot. But these indications of what he is not bring us but little nearer to that which he is, and it will be simpler and more straightforward to try to enumerate the principal qualities to which his genius appears to owe its distinctive flavour.

In the first place it must be remembered that Mr. Stevenson is not only a novelist. As has been indicated already, he was a man of letters before he took to romances, and, what is more, he was a literary artist. Here is one of the qualities which goes far to secure for a man a favourable hearing, not only in his own day, but also from the generations which shall succeed. And here Mr. Stevenson is pre-eminent among the novelists of to-day. No other living writer of fiction (we do not consider Mr. Pater as qualified to be included under this title in virtue of *Marius the Epicurean*, any more than Cardinal Newman, were he still among us, in virtue of *Callista*)—no other living writer of fiction takes such pains with his language or is master of a prose style possessing such a distinct literary flavour. The admirers of Mr. Meredith may, perhaps, dissent from this statement; but his is a

both
no m
write
man
of o
Full
of th
cons
to af
than
has t
he u
man
and
like
whic
at po
poet
M
the e
binar
Virg
pape
mag
expe
polis
what
for t
shou
read
ness
conv
desir
imag
and
instr
thou
even
no a
spear
in w
force
men
Men
lister

hothouse style, with startling effects, which allow the reader no rest, while Mr. Stevenson has formed himself upon the writers of the early, deliberate English prose. What if his manner smells sometimes a little of the lamp? It is the lamp of one who has sat up to read his Sir Thomas Browne, his Fuller, or his Burton, and no lover of literature will complain of this slight flavour of reminiscence. There is a certain self-consciousness about it, but it never, or very rarely, amounts to affectation. In one of his pleasant essays (in which, more than in the novels, this self-consciousness of style appears) he has told us that in the days of his apprenticeship to literature he used to exercise himself in composing passages in the manner of Hooker or Browne, or others of the older writers, and the traces of these exercises are still evident. Moreover, like most prose writers who are careful about the language which is the vehicle of their thoughts, he has tried his hand at poetry, and has shown that, if he has no claim to distinct poetical genius, he is at least a graceful artist in verse.

Mr. Stevenson, then, is a conscious literary artist, studying the exact values of words and the effects of their various combinations. This is especially evident in volumes such as *Virginibus Puerisque* and *Memories and Portraits*, or those papers which appeared recently in the pages of an American magazine. These are 'essays' in the true sense of the word—experiments, studies in style and language, finished and polished indeed, but not unfrequently less interesting for what is said than for the manner of saying it. In the novels, for the most part, the style is less in evidence. This is as it should be; it is a mistake to divert the attention of the reader from the matter of an important work by any obtrusiveness of the manner. The excellence of style consists there in conveying vividly and accurately the impression that is desired, and in so acting in subordination to the creative imagination as to make the reader see and hear the characters and the scenery which the author has imagined. It is the instrument of the imagination, the vehicle by which the thought has to be conveyed. And herein is its importance, even though it be an importance of the second rank. It is of no avail for an author to have the imagination of a Shakespeare unless he has also the power of expressing his visions in words. Genius of the first order will, it is true, generally force its way through the imperfections of language, but with men of lesser power the gift of style is not to be overrated. Men will listen to a writer with a pleasant style, as they will listen to an orator or a preacher with a pleasant voice. It gives

him a fair chance of being heard if he has anything to say that is worth the hearing.

Style, however, is subordinate to imagination, and it must now be considered whether Mr. Stevenson possesses the latter gift to such an extent as to entitle him to a hearing, either from this or from subsequent generations. Imagination, as applied to fiction, is shown principally in two directions—in the construction of the story and in the delineation of character. Aristotle, in treating of dramatic poetry, assigns the first place in importance to the story, and the second to the characters. The truth of this dictum may be questioned with regard to drama, and denied altogether with respect to fiction. Few novelists have excelled Wilkie Collins in ingenuity in the construction of a plot, while few have placed less reliance on the incidents of their story than Jane Austen; yet no one would maintain that the author of *The Moonstone* will hold as high a place in our literature as the authoress of *Pride and Prejudice*. A plot has a genuine interest in itself, but the greater part of its attractiveness disappears after the first or second reading, while one can return again and again to the study of a fine creation of character. Incidents are in their right place when they are introduced for the display and development of character, and when in their right place it is a high merit that they should be well conceived and worked out in themselves. The storming of Torquilstone Castle in *Ivanhoe* is sufficiently exciting in itself, but it also is of central importance in the evolution of the story, and exhibits the characters of the chief personages under circumstances of supreme interest; whereas irrelevant episodes, such as the desperate situations which are apt to occur at stated intervals in stories written for periodical magazines, only spoil the general effect, and dissipate, instead of concentrating, the interest.

Scott is assuredly the supreme master of the combination of incident and character, and it is therefore eminently satisfactory to observe that Mr. Stevenson appears to be a disciple of this greatest of novelists. He is certainly not wanting in the power to invent a striking plot. *Treasure Island* alone is evidence of this; but it is also seen in *Kidnapped* and *The Master of Ballantrae*, to say nothing of some of the minor stories. In all these, however, the story is not the whole object; except in the first-named there is no danger of its being taken for the principal object. The chief interest in all these works lies in the characters described in them; and it is this which essentially differentiates *Treasure Island* from its

cont
the
and
Sm
clea
acti
for t
of th
the
havi
Silv
hou
of th
bab
said
Kid
Ala
him
char
in t
rece
stan
him
narr
also

sent
pow
His
bein
auth
depi
The
whic
style

gran
the s
worl
twee
on th
abou
On
hou
is up

contemporary in appearance, *King Solomon's Mines*, and from the multitude of boys' books in which pirates and treasure and hair-breadth escapes equally play a part. Silver, Captain Smollett, Dr. Livesey, and Mr. Trelawney are all living persons, clearly imagined and vividly portrayed, both in word and action. It is in the conversations that Mr. Stevenson's genius for the creation of character especially appears. The speeches of the various personages of his stories have the naturalness, the inevitableness, which are the best signs of the characters having been well and truly conceived. The dialogue between Silver and Captain Smollett before the attack on the block-house, and the scene when Jim Hawkins falls into the hands of the mutineers, are admirably told, and have a life and probability which could hardly be bettered. The same might be said of almost the whole of the flight across Scotland in *Kidnapped* and of the conversations between David Balfour and Alan Breck. In *The Master of Ballantrae* both the Master himself and Mr. Henry, his brother, are admirably drawn characters—the first attractive in spite of his villainies, while in the second we see a man who thoroughly deserves and receives our sympathy, while we can at the same time understand how his worthless elder brother was preferred before him in the affections of nearly all who knew them. The narrator of the story, the faithful adherent of Mr. Henry, is also an excellent study in character.

Within his limits (which will have to be indicated presently) there is little to be said but praise for Mr. Stevenson's power alike of composing a story and delineating a character. His descriptions also are clear, and often striking, without being tedious and burdensome, as is the case with some authors who imagine themselves to have a special gift for depicting scenery. Perhaps the finest are to be found in *The Merry Men*, and from this a specimen may be quoted, which will serve at the same time to illustrate Mr. Stevenson's style and diction.

'On all this part of the coast, and especially near Aros, these great granite rocks that I have spoken of go down together in troops into the sea, like cattle on a summer's day. There they stand, for all the world like their neighbours ashore; only the salt water sobbing between them instead of the quiet earth, and clots of sea-pink blooming on their sides instead of heather; and the great sea-conger to wreath about the base of them instead of the poisonous viper of the land. On calm days you can go wandering between them in a boat for hours, echoes following you about the labyrinth; but when the sea is up, Heaven help the man that hears that cauldron boiling.

'Off the south-west end of Aros these blocks are very many, and much greater in size. Indeed, they must grow monstrously bigger out to sea, for there must be ten sea miles of open water sown with them as thick as a country place with houses, some standing thirty feet above the tides, some covered, but all perilous to ships; so that on a clear, westerly-blowing day I have counted from the top of Aros the great rollers breaking white and heavy over as many as six-and-forty buried reefs. But it is nearer in shore that the danger is worst; for the tide, here running like a mill-race, makes a long belt of broken water—a *Roost* we call it—at the tail of the land. I have often been out there in a dead calm at the slack of the tide; and a strange place it is, with the sea swirling and combing up and boiling like the cauldrons of a linn, and now and again a little dancing mutter of sound as though the Roost were talking to itself. But when the tide begins to run again, and above all in heavy weather, there is no man could take a boat within half a mile of it, nor a ship afloat that could either steer or live in such a place. You can hear the roaring of it six miles away. At the seaward end there comes the strongest of the hubble; and it's here that those big breakers dance together—the dance of death, it may be called—that have got the name, in these parts, of the Merry Men. I have heard it said that they run fifty feet high; but that must be the green water only, for the spray runs twice as high as that. Whether they got the name from their movements, which are swift and antic, or from the shouting they make about the turn of the tide, so that all Aros shakes with it, is more than I can tell.'

Mr. Stevenson is naturally most at home in Scotch scenery, and, as he can also write in Scotch dialect, the stories of which the scene is laid in his native land are perhaps the most attractive of his works. Here again he is following in the footsteps of his great compatriot, and if authors are nowadays to be classed in 'schools' Mr. Stevenson must be placed, not in the school of Thackeray, or of Dickens, or of George Eliot, but as a disciple of the school of Scott. His genius lies in the same direction, though he has not the boundless wealth of imagination and fertility of production which characterizes his master. He has, however, gifts which should enable him to go far. He has the greatest of all, imagination, and he is a finished literary artist. With these he has lesser but very attractive qualities, which have already been indicated. He has great wealth of fancy, often extravagant, often quaint, sometimes grotesque, but always pleasing. He has a light hand to deal with light matters, and no contemporary writer is a pleasanter companion for an occasional half-hour, whether as story-teller or as essayist. Then he has an interest, half sympathetic, half with a certain

¹ *The Merry Men*, pp. 6-8.

sense
conso
murde
and
spira
and
serio
inter
man,
and I

P
place
both
which
howe
are li
first
itself
who
treat
of an
wom
fema
chara
in th
figur
Balle
the v
thoug
Mast
inter
it ex
sake
of th
It is
Cuba
hardl
mere
The
there
love
surfe
on th
week
leads

sense of superiority, in the vagaries of the human mind and conscience. He studies alike the mental composition of a murderer and of the poor creature who dabbles in dynamite and believes himself to be a patriotic and high-souled conspirator. He possesses that salt of life and literature, humour, and employs it lightly and gracefully; and, above all, in serious and lighter work alike he is full throughout of human interest, and delights in the study of that strange creature, man, with his absurdities and his aspirations, his weaknesses and his struggles, his virtues, his vicissitudes, and his crimes.

Possessing these qualities, it is not surprising that a high place should be claimed for Mr. Stevenson by his admirers, both among contemporary writers and in that wider sphere which includes the greater names of every age. It is time, however, to look to his limitations, and to see how far they are likely to hamper his flight towards the immortals. And first there is a very marked and striking limitation, which in itself almost amounts to high treason against the goddess who presides over the modern novel. This relates to his treatment of women. Mr. Stevenson has attempted no story of any length in which an important part is played by a woman. *Treasure Island* and *Kidnapped* have practically no female interest at all. In *The Black Arrow* there is the character of Joan Sedley, but she is only slightly drawn, and in the latter half of the book she is little more than a lay figure. Something more is attempted in *The Master of Ballantrae*, for some pains are taken with the portraiture of the ward of Lord Durrisdeer, the wife of Henry Durie, though her heart was given to the undeserving but attractive Master. But here, again, the outline is not filled in; the interest of the story attaches mainly, and in the latter part of it exclusively, to the men, and we feel that it is only for the sake of the influence which her existence had on the fortunes of the two brothers that Alison Graeme is introduced at all. It is the same with Mr. Stevenson's minor stories. *The Fair Cuban* and *the Old Lady of the Superfluous Mansion* are hardly serious contributions to literature, and *Olalla* is a mere passing sketch, pathetic indeed, but very shadowy. The objects of his serious studies are exclusively men. Now, there is undoubtedly some justice in the complaint that love stories are nowadays somewhat overdone. Readers surfeited with the products of the lending library, who follow on the average the fortunes of some two love affairs every week, may reasonably hail with some relief an author who leads them off this beaten track and treats them to the

luxury of a story full of the wilder excitements to which they were accustomed in the days of their youth, but told in a manner infinitely superior to that which was sufficient for their less developed years. But an author who has an eye to something more enduring than the lending library cannot afford to ignore half the human race and that passion which after all plays such a transcendent part in the thoughts and actions of mankind. From the days of Agur the son of Jakeh 'the way of a man with a maid' has been one of the standing problems which have exercised the minds of men, and it has provided the central interest in the dramas of human life which have occupied the stage or the printing press in successive ages. Mr. Stevenson cannot, without a very serious diminution of his reputation and of his chances of immortality, neglect such a wide and such an important field of interest. It is abundantly clear from his other writings that he is no misogynist, and that he has had opportunities of studying the female mind and character as well as that of men. What is the cause, then, of his marked abstinence from grappling with it in his romances? Is it that he mistrusts his power of fathoming and of doing justice to its intricacies? The fear is not unnatural; but we think better of Mr. Stevenson's powers of observation and imagination. It is not too late for the omission to be supplied, and it may be hoped that in some shortly forthcoming work he will at least make an attempt to supply it, and to take into his sphere of operations some portion of that field which he has hitherto neglected.

This is the most specific and definite limitation of Mr. Stevenson's genius, but if we were asked to state what reasons, if any, caused us to doubt whether his reputation would be maintained in the generations to come, we should be inclined to allege a certain lack of strength to fill a large canvas, a restriction of the field which he can command at one time. The great masters of romance have been able to deal at once with a multitude of interacting characters, to present a picture of a period of history or a state of society which have an interest beyond the leading personages to whom they form the background. Take almost any novel of Sir Walter Scott's. In *Ivanhoe* we have the characters of Ivanhoe himself, of Richard Cœur-de-Lion, Bois-Guilbert, De Bracy, Front-de-Bœuf, Prince John, Cedric, Athelstane, Locksley, Friar Tuck, Wamba, Gurth, Isaac of York, Rebecca, and Rowena, all of whom are living personages in whom we feel a real interest, in addition to the general picture of a

definit
vision
repres
centur
interes
consci
noveli
his he
or of g
the slu
before
magna
with i
Steven
to har
and o
which
tions i
whate
Islana
the w
is occ
Kidna
and v
There
few of
nent
contin
which
The L
in onc
in it,
pictur
other
are no
charac
Ballan
and o
person
Mr. S
one, h
and t
not c
exter
remain
VO

definite period in history. In *Quentin Durward* we have a vision of France under Louis XI., in *Rob Roy* a most vivid representation of the Scotch and Border life of the last century. We feel that we have before us the whole world of interests of which the principal actors in the story were conscious. The same may be said of any of the other great novelists. Thackeray shows us the whole society in which his heroes moved, whether it be in the reign of George III. or of good Queen Anne. Dickens gives us the little world of the slums or of middle-class vulgarity. George Eliot brings before us the life of a Midland village, with all the local magnates and the petty local gossip, or of mediæval Florence with its trivialities as well as its inspirations. But with Mr. Stevenson it is not so. It may be that he doubts his power to handle a large canvas, with its many complexities of action and of character. It may be that the physical weakness of which he is, as we deeply regret to learn from many indications in his works, a victim, reacts also on his writings. But, whatever be the cause, the fact is surely evident. In *Treasure Island* we have a group of persons isolated from the rest of the world, pursuing one definite object; and the whole tale is occupied with this single episode in their lives. In *Kidnapped* we are concerned chiefly with but two persons, and with but one brief, though exciting, series of events. There are, it is true, some small but excellent sketches of a few other individuals, but there is no one who plays a prominent part in the narrative; and we would willingly have that continuation of the history of Alan Breck and David Balfour which Mr. Stevenson half promises us at the end of his story. *The Black Arrow* appears at first to cover a wider field, and in one sense it actually does so. There are more characters in it, and it contains an interesting, though incomplete, picture of an eventful epoch in English history; but, on the other hand, it is marred by too great sensationalism, and we are not very much interested in the fortunes of any of the characters except the hero, Richard Shelton. *The Master of Ballantrae* has the merit of covering a longer space of time, and of carrying us through with the fortunes of the principal personages, and in this respect it is a distinct advance on Mr. Stevenson's other stories; but the stage is a very small one, holding not more than five persons of any importance, and the minuteness with which these are worked out does not compensate for the want of a larger setting and a more extended sphere of action. The general result is that they remain studies rather than a great picture; and this is perhaps

the tendency of the whole of Mr. Stevenson's work. He can tell in detail the story of an isolated episode, or he can study minutely the characters of a single person or a very small group of persons ; but he has not yet given us the great and comprehensive masterpiece to which all these studies should lead us on.

In this limitation of the field within which he chooses to work Mr. Stevenson somewhat resembles Nathaniel Hawthorne. *The Scarlet Letter* and *The House of the Seven Gables*, like the stories just enumerated, are elaborate studies of a small group of characters within a closely circumscribed area. But except for this fact, and for a certain literary flavour which attends all that Hawthorne wrote, as it does everything of Mr. Stevenson's, there is little resemblance between the methods of the two novelists. Hawthorne confines himself for the most part to description, and rarely ventures to reproduce a conversation ; while with Mr. Stevenson the characters unfold themselves very largely by means of speech—a method which undoubtedly possesses greater life and implies a higher power of imagination and creation. Further, Hawthorne rather avoids striking incidents, while Mr. Stevenson abounds in them, touching, as has been said already, the school of sensational adventure on the one side, while on the other he belongs to the school of psychological anatomy. It is this comprehensiveness of genius that constitutes one of the chief grounds of the high expectations that have been formed of Mr. Stevenson. With all these powers in him he ought to produce something great and permanent, if he has the force to combine all his faculties to work in one field of adequate proportions. The danger is lest he should continue to follow now one, now the other side of his genius, continuing to give us delightful and masterly studies instead of the great work ; and lest the artist in him, which takes pleasure in this minute and finished craftsmanship, should overpower the creative imagination which he has shown himself to possess in a very signal manner.

It is time that we had a new great writer. The period of Victorian literature is passing away, with its brilliant record of great names in all departments of art, and we have as yet nothing to take its place. Each year now takes from us one of the men who have made the Victorian period what it has been. Browning is gone, and Newman is gone, and Matthew Arnold is gone, and Tennyson and Ruskin are old and cannot, in the course of nature, be left to us for long. In poetry and prose alike the outlook is somewhat gloomy.

We seem to have reached one of those intervals which separate great periods of literary production from one another, in which the genius of the nation seems to rest and recover itself before making another effort of its many-sided energy. We look back as matters of history to the time when each year brought forth a new volume of Wordsworth or Byron, and when the mails were besieged by eager readers expecting a new *Waverley*; or to that later period, within our own age, when each succeeding month might be placing before us instalments of a *Pickwick* or a *Vanity Fair*, and when any publishing season might produce an *Esmond* or a *Romola*, a fresh contribution to *Bells and Pomegranates* or a new *Idyll of the King*.

'Ah, the great time! Had I been there to taste!

..... Who carves Promachos?

Who writes the *Oresteia*?'

We live in no such age of great and original production now, but seem to be only gathering in the gleanings of that which is past; and therefore our eyes are naturally open for the signs of the coming of another wearer of the mantle of the prophets. With all its apparatus of criticism this age ought not to miss discerning anyone who has the notes of greatness upon him. In the realm of fiction we know of no one who possesses these notes in any adequate degree, unless it be the author of whom we have been speaking in this article. Mr. Stevenson is no longer a young writer, it is true, and he is unfortunately burdened by ill-health; but we hope and trust that he has many years of work yet before him. We owe him much already for amusement, for interest, and for profit; but we hope to owe him still more before the record of his work is closed. And we hope that the debt will not be confined to us of this present day alone. He has earned the gratitude and admiration of his contemporaries; let him earn also the gratitude and admiration of posterity.

3n Memoriam.

HENRY PARRY LIDDON.

OUR readers, we think, will not accuse us of exaggeration if we say that the death of Dr. Liddon, at a time when he seemed to be on the way to recovery from a very severe illness, is the greatest loss which the Church of England has sustained for several years. As far as we have observed, the tone of the secular press, in commenting upon his ecclesiastical career, has been marked by respect and kindness, except in a certain quarter where, presumably, he could not be forgiven for setting Christianity and the Church above all party politics. Of course one could not expect his name to evoke such a chorus of fervid homage as arose on all sides, a few weeks earlier, in honour of 'the great Cardinal.' But had Newman been merely a greater Liddon—had the Church which he once did so much to awaken and to 'transform' retained to the end her hold on that high and solitary spirit which, as was said in 1864, passed through us without being really one of us¹—had he not ceased to be within that Church a resisting force against Puritanism and Rationalism—perhaps we may add, had he not, in 'beautiful and revered old age,'² received from a wise Pope that crowning Roman honour which reflected honour on England herself—the newspapers would hardly have filled their columns with panegyrics on his life, or with the details of his stately funeral. *Requiescat in pace.* He did us, in the early Tractarian period, so much good that we have no heart to dwell on the mischief wrought by his Romeward movement, and by the shock of its long-delayed consummation. It is of another, who was all our own, ever faithful to his Church, ever 'good at need' in her cause, and in the cause of the faith as she holds and teaches it—one whose course, it has been well said, never needed explanation or 'apologia'—that we would now say a few words; and if, for lack of space, we limit ourselves to his work as a preacher and writer, we know full well how much that limitation excludes. For Henry Liddon was much more than a preacher or a writer. We have lost by this great public bereavement one of those strong and beautiful personalities which ordinary people encounter but twice or thrice in a lifetime. To be acquainted with him was to admire him from the outset; intercourse, as it advanced towards intimacy, brought with it a series of vivid impressions of recollections at once instructive and inspiring; there was nothing in him of that vagueness, thinness, inexpressiveness, which makes conversation so unfruitful and so vapid: and those whom he honoured with his friendship had before them an exemplar of tender and generous fidelity, of pathetic warmheartedness, of unlimited self-suppression where service or help could be rendered, which might well 'leave them mourning' as if in shame. There was also in Liddon a peculiar nobleness of aim and motive, which made men feel that whoever else might drift into self-seeking, or worship the golden

¹ *Christian Remembrancer*, xlviii. 169; 'Dr. Newman's Apology.'

² *Shairp's Aspects of Poetry*, p. 440.

image of the world, *that* would he never; and this assurance may have been the real ground of the lifting and exhilarating effect of his presence, even when, as was of late years the case, his sense of 'the logic of events'¹—a sense which, perhaps, was more adapted to French than to English conditions of life—acting upon a highly sensitive nature, disposed him to take unhopeful views of the prospects of religion in a 'revolutionized' Oxford, and proportionately impaired his influence over her younger sons. That influence had been at its height when he held the chair of Exegesis, and when, independently of any official duties, he used to give on Sunday evenings, during many continuous terms, those masterly expositions of the Epistles which did so much to bring home to young men the grandeur and comprehensiveness of New Testament study, and also to train them in habits of accurate distinction. Many will remember how much they learned from the delicately-worded suggestion to 'draw a line along that verse,' or to 'put a "1" or "2" in the margin.' It is very much to be lamented that he could never find time, amid the stress of later work, to put these comments into a permanent form.

But we are outstepping the bounds which we have traced. Liddon had begun life, so to speak, as curate to Mr. Butler, the present Dean of Lincoln, at Wantage. He early made his mark as a preacher; and it was, we believe, soon after a difference of 'theological standing place'² between himself and Bishop Wilberforce, accentuated in the Bishop's mind by Mr. C. P. Golightly's denunciations, constrained him to resign the vice-principalship of Cuddesdon College, that he gave promise of future pre-eminence as a University preacher by delivering in the cathedral at Oxford a brilliant Ascension Day sermon, which exhibits, in a somewhat pronounced form, the early characteristics of his 'manner.' He was then only in his thirty-first year. Afterwards the rhetorical efflorescence which had resulted from his study of great French models became perceptibly restrained, while the impression of power, of a reserve force of underlying thought, was deepened.

The first volume of his University sermons, originally entitled *Some Words for God*, included discourses ranging between the years 1860 and 1868; and among these are some which might well be consulted by young preachers who have to bring home the teaching of the great anniversary solemnities; we might especially indicate 'The Lessons of the Holy Manger' and 'The Divine Victim.'

The second volume, not unnaturally, is still richer and more suggestive than the first. Anyone who seriously considers it will feel the amplitude and splendour of the mind with which he is thus far brought into contact. We would recommend particularly three sermons—on 'Sacerdotalism,' on 'The Prophecy of the Magnificat,'

¹ There was, no doubt, a certain absoluteness in his intellectual temperament which might sometimes dispose him to overlook qualifying considerations. And he was somewhat disposed to contract the range of open questions.

² The Bishop's own phrase, *Life of Wilberforce*, ii. 366. But the Bishop had been, at the outset, informed by Mr. Butler as to Liddon's sacramental beliefs (*Guardian*, September 17, p. 1453).

on 'The Worth of Faith in a Life to come.' And as we have alluded to differences of theological tone which separated him to some extent—though never in affection—from that great prelate, 'the remodeller of the English Episcopate,' who, however, was hardly to be called a divine, we will place together two sentences which will exhibit, on one main point, a substantial unity of idea. Preaching at St. Mary's in 1875, Liddon said: 'That which is really objected to [as sacerdotalism] would seem to be the claim to speak and act in the things of God under a Divine commission . . . to be part of the Divine plan of reconciliation, as actually given to the world, however humble and subordinate a part.'¹ Eight years before, Bishop Wilberforce had written: 'Most of those who speak of sacerdotalism mean only a real belief in the kingdom of grace.'²

We can but briefly refer to the published volumes of sermons preached at St. Paul's during Advent, Easter, and Christmastide.³ They exhibit the same elaborateness and fulness of exposition or of argument, but under forms better suited to a non-academic audience, and more frequently relieved by vivid references to the actual trials of London life,⁴ by pithy anecdotes, by a wealth of illustration, and even increasingly by delightful touches of humour. No London preacher was ever more resolutely practical, less afraid of touching real problems and stating plain facts. Perhaps the inevitable reiteration, in successive years, of the topics belonging to the sacred seasons in their recurrence makes the reader conscious of a certain degree of monotony. But Dr. Liddon would have said, as St. Athanasius used to say, 'One must not be tired of repeating.' He preached as one who had a message which must be delivered: the old truths had to be enforced and re-enforced: for him they were ever fresh, ever vital and vitalising, all-satisfying, inexhaustible. Why should we waste words about a fact so universally acknowledged as that Liddon's preaching in St. Paul's, carried on with calamitous results to health and strength for twenty years, was a literally unexampled power, a peerless instance, in our modern English experience, of the efficacy of this great ministration in the hands of one whose cultivated gift of 'sacred oratory' is united with the fire of enthusiasm for God and for souls? Nor should it be forgotten, as an element of his influence over thoughtful hearers, that his enthusiasm was always combined with a steady grasp of his subject in all its parts, producing an excellence of arrangement which makes his sermons so good to 'analyze.'⁵

¹ *Univ. Sermons*, ii. 192.

² *Life*, iii. 233.

³ Of course we do not forget the numerous sermons preached on special occasions, and published at the time. A collection of these would form a *liber aureus*. Nor do we lose sight of the volume on *Church Troubles*, with its very opportune Preface, nor of that latest volume on the *Magnificent*, published when he had begun to entertain the foreboding that his 'days on earth were drawing towards their close.'

⁴ See *Adv. Sermon* i. 279; *Easter Sermon* ii. 273.

⁵ Dr. Clifford, a Baptist minister, spoke of the 'fire' which 'enforced his masculine reasoning' (*Guardian*, September 17).

The volume called *Some Elements of Religion* consists of Lenten lectures delivered at St. James's, Piccadilly, in 1870, the year of his promotion to the London canonry. They are a precious contribution to English apologetic. It must here suffice to recite their titles: 'The Idea of Religion,' 'God, the Object of Religion,' 'The Soul, the Subject of Religion,' 'Sin, the Obstacle to Religion,' 'Prayer, the Characteristic Action of Religion,' 'The Mediator, the Guarantee of Religious Life.' We wish that all candidates for ordination were encouraged to steep their minds in the teaching of this inestimable little book, especially of the concluding lecture.

What are we to say of the *Bampton Lectures* of 1866 on 'The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour?' After they were delivered and published, Liddon expressed a wish that he had used the phrase 'Deity,' in view of the disposition shown in some quarters to juggle with the word 'divinity,' as if it were compatible with a sentimental Humanitarianism.¹ However, no reader of the first few pages would be able to mistake what the preacher meant by 'Divinity'; he excludes emphatically and of set purpose those 'equivocations' in the use of the term 'which might again and again obscure the true point before us.' The most characteristic portions of these wonderful lectures are that which sets forth 'our Lord's Divinity as witnessed by His consciousness,'² and that which draws out the 'consequences' of this august doctrine. In this last lecture stress is laid on the fact that no lower Christology can be an effective safeguard for true Theism; that the belief in our Saviour's Deity can alone account for the virtue attributed in the New Testament to His Passion;³ that it 'forbids the depreciation of the sacraments,' while they in turn contribute to sustain it; that it has proved its 'moral fruitfulness' in the development of the Christian graces of purity, humility, and charity. One to whom all Christian doctrine was aglow with life, and fraught with motive power, could not close what he calls 'an attempt to reassert, against some misapprehensions of modern thought, the great truth which guards the honour of Christ, and is the most precious intellectual heritage of Christians,' without urging on his hearers the intimate relation between its acceptance and the 'sanctification' of the soul. He will not call it merely an orthodox dogma;⁴ to get hold of it is, for him, to gain some 'clearer sight of the Divine Person of our glorious and living Lord.' 'Do not allow yourselves to rest content with' an 'intellectual persuasion . . . The Divine Christ of the Gospel is at this moment all that He was eighteen centuries ago. . . . The hours of life pass, they do not return. . . . *Pereunt et imputantur*. But the present is our own; we may resolve, if we will, to live as men who live for the glory of an Incarnate God.' Whatever

¹ See *Univ. Sermons*, ii. 177.

² Compare his *Elements of Religion*, p. 218 ff.; *Univ. Sermon* i. 235; *Easter Sermon* i. 44; *Advent Sermon* i. 186, 424.

³ Compare *Univ. Sermon* i. 237; *Advent Sermon* i. 225; *Christmastide Sermon* p. 335.

⁴ For enforcements of the necessity of dogma as bearing on effective Christian beliefs, see *Univ. Sermon* i. 94, 183, ii. 132.

truth lies in the proverb, *Pectus facit theologum*, could not be better illustrated than by the peroration of these lectures. No one was more convinced than Liddon that, as he used to say, theology was 'an affair of propositions : ' but to no one were its propositions more full of spirit and of life. We may add that in this same concluding discourse he emphasizes the distinction—too often forgotten of late—between 'limitation of knowledge' and 'fallibility.' If there was a point on which our Lord's human mind was at a certain time 'nescient,' and on which accordingly He did not pronounce, this does not go one step towards the conclusion that on matters on which He *did* make positive affirmation He could err. And it cannot be concealed that distress and anxiety as to certain passages in the volume called *Lux Mundi*—coming as they did from Pusey House—did, in fact, contribute to the burden which weighed on him so heavily in the last year of his life.

We must pass over some of Dr. Liddon's minor publications, but it is well to call attention to his preface to a translation of Rosmini's *Five Wounds of the Church*.

This notice has, we confess it, extended insensibly beyond the range usually allowed for an 'In Memoriam.' We can but plead that the case is truly exceptional; the career that has closed is in many respects unique. We wish that we had space for instances of Dr. Liddon's remarkable versatility in bringing to bear on his subject the resources of a widely cultured mind. Readers of his sermons will remember passages which light up whole periods of ancient, mediæval, and modern Church history; ¹ passages which summarize our case against Roman 'developments' ² or Protestant diminutions of the area of Christian doctrine; passages which pluck off disguises from this or that false theory of life, from this or that substitute for a solid and vital religion; ³ passages which recognize, as some of late have been pleased to assume that Dr. Liddon did not recognize, the working of 'law' in all departments of God's world, ⁴ or the indispensable obligation of what are called the 'natural' virtues, ⁵ or the possible necessity of 'surrendering misapprehensions along the frontier where the faith touches on the province of physics,' ⁶ or of accepting a theory of evolution which should recognize God as the source of its 'impulse;' ⁷ or terse and brilliant sayings with which we could fill pages, and in which are concentrated whole masses of argument and of experience. But we conclude by asking those who know Dr. Liddon's writings to consider for themselves whether three deep-seated convictions, or, to put it otherwise, three dominant ideas, may not be said to underlie and characterize his habits of thought as a Christian teacher. The real existence, the moral character, and the 'absolute claims' of a living God,

¹ *Univ. Sermon*. ii. 171 ff., 194, 210, 232, 296. Compare his frequent references to the life of St. Augustine, as *ibid.* i. 17; *Adv. Sermon*. i. 116.

² *Univ. Sermon*. ii. 71, 112 ff.

³ *Ibid.* i. 33 ff., 310, ii. 56; *Adv. Sermon*. ii. 131, 234.

⁴ *Univ. Sermon*. ii. 81.

⁵ *Ibid.* i. 324.

⁶ *Ibid.* ii. 41, 180. For a recognition of criticism, see *ibid.* ii. 116; on degrees of inspiration, *ibid.* 85.

on whom the soul depends 'from moment to moment,' and whom it ought to enthrone at the 'centre' of its thought, instead of 'banishing' Him to a point on the 'circumference'—this was, in the first instance, a 'root-fact' for Liddon. He is never weary of returning to it; ¹ it is never obscured for him by truths distinctively Christian; its presence gives consistency to his whole system of belief. Secondly, what Cardinal Newman says, in the concluding pages of his *Grammar of Assent*, about the power of one 'sovereign thought,' 'the image or idea' of the personal and adorable Lord Jesus, as dominant in the primitive Christian mind, was literally true in regard to Liddon.² This was the animating principle of his contention for the Catholic formulas of faith, as well as of all that he said on the Incarnation as operating through the ordinances,³ and of grace as a power proceeding from Christ's fulness.⁴ It may be remembered that an outburst of this loyal devotion startled and thrilled his hearers at the conclusion of his fourth Bampton lecture; 'Eternal Jesus, it is Thyself who hast thus bidden us either despise Thee or worship Thee!' in reference, of course, to the argument which he did so much to make familiar, from the habitual 'self-assertion' of a Teacher morally perfect. And lastly, the essential supremacy of the moral, the spiritual, the eternal over what was the material and temporal—although earthly or secular life was duly honoured as God's ordinance—appears and reappears in all that Liddon wrote. It was for him a decisive answer to all materialist and secularist theories; it invested life, as a scene of probation and preparation, with an awful seriousness, and with a dignity which irreligious views of it made impossible; it established the antecedent probability of a revelation;⁵ it supplied a *rationale* of the miraculous;⁶ it coloured the whole conception of Christian evidence;⁷ it fostered a vigilant hostility to the modern Pelagianism which substitutes nature for grace, to the modern Erastianism which would absorb the Church into the world. Liddon was, of course, described as an enthusiastic High Churchman; but for him High Churchmanship was involved in high Christianity.

Henry Parry Liddon, the eldest son of Captain Matthew Liddon, R.N., was born at North Stoneham, Hants, August 20, 1829. He was educated at King's College School, became a Student of Christ Church, took his degree (second class in classics) in 1850, was ordained in 1852, was vice-principal of Cuddesdon from 1854 to 1859, then became vice-principal of St. Edmund Hall, and afterwards ex-

¹ *E.g.*, *Univ. Ser.* i. 13, ii. 20, 53, 105, 152; *Adv. Ser.* ii. 26, 186.

² We heartily thank the Dean of Gloucester for recognizing, in a sermon preached on September 14, Liddon's motive in his 'life-work'—'to defend the true story of his dearest Lord.' *Guardian*, September 17.

³ *Univ. Ser.* i. 205, 301, ii. 110; *Easter Ser.* ii. 112, 179; *Christmas Ser.* p. 151.

⁴ *Univ. Ser.* i. 44, 66, ii. 35; *Adv. Ser.* i. 235.

⁵ *Univ. Ser.* ii. 49, 213; *Adv. Ser.* i. 195.

⁶ *Univ. Ser.* i. 270; *Easter Ser.* i. 174.

⁷ Compare *Univ. Ser.* ii. 216 with Mozley's *Lectures*, p. 280 ff.

aming chaplain to Bishop Hamilton and Prebendary of Salisbury, Ireland Professor of Exegesis from 1870 to 1882, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's from 1870 until his death, at Weston-super-Mare, on September 9, 1890. He declined the Deanery of Worcester and the See of Edinburgh in 1886, and the See of Albans in 1890.

P.S.—Our readers will have seen from the public prints that at a meeting held in the chapter house at St. Paul's immediately after Dr. Liddon's funeral on Tuesday, September 16, it was decided to do honour to his memory by raising a fund, to be applied in the first instance to erect an effigy or other like personal memorial of him in St. Paul's Cathedral; and secondly, to provide means for assisting members of the University of Oxford to study theology more thoroughly—the fund for the latter purpose to be administered by the Council of Keble College, which may be truly said to supply a guarantee, in regard to the future interests of definite Christian truth, such as cannot be found in a Theological Professoriate filled up, for the most part, by the Prime Minister of the day—a fact never absent from the mind of Dr. Liddon. Great emphasis was laid at this meeting on the *personal* character of the memorial in the Cathedral, and from this intention we trust that no consideration will allow the Committee to swerve. Subscribers are invited to allocate their subscriptions to one or other of these objects, or to hand them over to the general fund, as they may think best.

To both these forms of memorial we wish God speed. It must not, however, be forgotten (to borrow a thought from an eloquent sermon preached on the occasion of Dr. Liddon's death by the Rev. William Cooke, Honorary Canon of Chester) that the truest memorial to such a devoted champion of the Cross is that in which all, the richest and the poorest alike, can join: 'Remember them which had the rule over you, which spake unto you the Word of God, and considering the issue of their life, IMITATE THEIR FAITH' (Hebr. xiii. 7, R.V.)

SHORT NOTICES.

Lux Mundi. *A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation.* Edited by CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Tenth Edition. (London: John Murray, 1890.)

THE *corrigenda* inserted in the fourth edition of *Lux Mundi* we have already noticed at the end of the article in which we originally reviewed that book,¹ but the further modifications of language and additional matter in the tenth edition, now before us, seem to call for comment from us. One important addition is the Appendix on 'the Christian doctrine of sin.' This Appendix consists of the greater part of a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on March 17,

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1890, 'Theology and Criticism.'

1889, by the Principal of Pusey House, this particular method of treatment being adopted, we are told, partly because of the 'advantage in producing what was not written in view of the criticisms on *Lux Mundi*.' It is a sermon which we do not feel able unreservedly to commend. To us it appears to take too low a view of the condition of Adam, to pass too lightly over the results of the Fall and the wounding of the nature which remains in the unbaptized; we think it written too obviously in view of objections sometimes raised against the belief of Christians; we could wish that in the last paragraph it had merely been stated that the doctrine of original sin rests upon wider foundations than a particular interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis, without implying how far the writer is prepared to go in conceding the unhistorical character of this part of Holy Scripture. But, when all this is said, we must regard much that is here published as a valuable contribution to a very difficult subject. The protest against Dualism, the emphasis on the facts that sin is always a distortion, and that its seat is in the will, the triumphant assertion of the glorious possibilities of human life aided by the grace of God, are as greatly needed as they are forcibly expressed. As the writer himself points out (p. 526, n. 1), it is a sermon rather than an essay, and it may well have done a sermon's work in producing in some a horror of sin and a hope of recovery.

Among the 'changes of importance,' a note of some length is added to the essay on 'Faith,' stating the object of the essay and speaking of the relation between nature and grace.

'This essay,' it is said, 'has, for its sole aim, the reassurance of an existing faith in face of temporary perplexities. . . . It recalls the depth and security with which the roots of faith run back into the original constitution of man; which original constitution, however broken, thwarted, maimed, polluted by sin, remains still in us as the sole pledge and ground of our possible redemption in Christ, Who comes to restore the blurred image of God in us, and Who must find in us the radical elements of the supernatural nature which He enters to renew. . . . In all our treatment of redemption we must begin by recalling what it was which Christ entered to restore' (p. 54).

Taking this note as an assertion of the truths that the 'image of God' in which man was created has never been lost, but only deprived of the 'supernatural gifts' of 'original righteousness,' and that the nature of man is the Nature which the Son of God took to Himself in redeeming man—every Catholic will heartily agree with this meaning of it. We hope we shall not be thought hypercritical if we say that we do not feel the words 'the radical elements of the supernatural nature which He enters to renew' very happily chosen to express the condition of man's nature as it is at birth.

The remaining changes have a special interest for ourselves as affecting passages upon which we deemed it our duty to comment with some severity. An alteration on pages 289-90, and the notes there added, now show that the writer of the essay on 'The Atonement' is wishful to avoid an interpretation of his words which would regard our Lord as capable of sin, and we are thankful for

the modification of the passage on page 296. As regards the former of these two passages, we would still remark that on a point so important, and on which mistakes are so easily and commonly made, we think it would have been well more expressly to assert that, while resistance to temptation in our Lord required the effort of will it requires in us, it was impossible for His will, acting as it did in a single Divine Personality, to choose anything that was not good. We still miss some phrase which might correspond to the Augustinian 'absit ut vellet.'¹ In the essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' the references to Holy Scripture in the note on page 346, which we went through in detail with the intention of showing that they did not bear out the opinion sought to be based upon them, are, with the exception of Micah v. 2-6, omitted, a reference to Dr. Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* being inserted in their place, and the following addition is made to the note on page 345 :

'In view of criticisms it may be explained that in the account of the prophet given above, only that view of his inspiration is taken into consideration which appeals first to the enquirer (cf. the words in the next paragraph "in this general sense at least"). When once this primary assurance of inspiration is gained the evidence of detailed prophecies will be found cogent. As we compare the anticipations of the Messiah or of the "Righteous Servant" in such passages as Ps. xxii., Is. liii., vii. 14, or ix. 6, 7, with their fulfilment in Jesus Christ, we recognize a special action of the Holy Ghost, marking even in details the continuity of His method. Cf. p. 167 referred to above.'

We cannot say we are satisfied with this part of the essay, as it now stands. We think there is still a tendency to refer too much of the messages of the prophets to the fallible mind of man and too little to the infallible revelation of God. We can only repeat our own belief that 'the whole predictive announcement was supernaturally freed from liability to mistake.'² But we are bound to recognize that the writer of the essay, however far he may be willing to go in conceding that the prophet's message was largely clothed by the prophet himself, and that such details might be mistaken anticipations, is earnestly anxious to assert that the central parts of the prophetic teaching were revealed by the Holy Spirit, and share in the certainty which pertains to what God declares. We regret some concessions he appears to be willing to make. We distrust the criticism which underlies the conclusions which are thought to necessitate these concessions. Yet we may hope that he is less ready to admit interpretations of some prophetic passages which we cannot regard as other than disastrous, than the note which is now omitted led us to think. But we must still say with all the emphasis we can, that Inspiration and prophecy

¹ St. Augustine, *Op. imperf. c. Julianum*, iv. 48. Compare the context of the passage quoted from *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 10, in the note on p. 290 of the tenth edition of *Lux Mundi*. In that place St. Anselm says : 'Possumus itaque dicere de Christo, quia potuit mentiri, si subaudiatur, si vellet ; et quoniam mentiri non potuit nolens, nec potuit velle mentiri, non minus dici potest nequivisse mentiri. Sic itaque potuit et non potuit mentiri.'

² *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1890, p. 215.

differ from the keenest insight as completely as the direct gift of God differs from the working of the mind of man.

There is a new preface of thirty pages of very great interest. It makes clear, what we ourselves never thought doubtful, that the whole aim of the book was to defend the Christian Faith. However much we may have dissented from some parts of its teaching, we have never doubted that we were formerly right in regarding *Lux Mundi* as an attempt to help those who are perplexed to a firmer belief, and as written by men wishful to be entirely loyal to the faith of Christ.¹ With much that is said as to the need which sometimes presents itself of the 'readjustment, or fresh correlation, of the things of faith and the things of knowledge' (pp. xii, xiii) we are in agreement. Our fear about *Lux Mundi* is that the readjustment has been attempted by sacrificing what is necessary to the right maintenance of Christian truth. So, too, we should agree that a work of this kind would not necessarily include a full discussion 'as to the seat and methods of Church authority' (p. xiii). Our complaint is that a true view of Church authority requires a distinction between nature and grace, natural knowledge and revelation, which has seemed to us to be sometimes lost sight of; it is not that the subject is left untouched, but that we fear some statements on other matters are not compatible with the right treatment of it. In the part of the preface in which the writer of the essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' speaks in his own name we are thankful to notice the repudiation of the 'extreme conclusions of Wellhausen' (p. xx).² We entirely agree that there is a difference between the position of this particular critic and that of other writers who are here named. But it is clear that Mr. Gore is still willing to concede a great deal which it seems to us impossible to allow. There are many questions which criticism may safely be left to work out for itself. But when we are asked to admit that the writer of the *Chronicles* related in an historical account fiction as if it was fact, we do not see how any consideration of 'the literary conscience of the time' (p. xxx), or the possible absence of intentional fraud will allow us to say that such a narrative was inspired by the Holy Ghost. And when we are asked to concede that the early part of *Genesis* may be unhistorical (p. xxviii), whatever latitude of interpretation of particular details we may be disposed to regard as possible, we must point out that the Apostolic authority is pledged to the belief that one man, possessed of grace, by a definite act of disobedience, chose evil and rejected good, and that from him the whole human race is descended and derives a nature marred by his sin.³ And, again,

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1890, pp. 196, 234.

² Yet it would have been more satisfactory to us to have been assured that this repudiation extends further than to details. The whole principles involved in Wellhausen's critical position—and it is often the case that premisses are more important than conclusions—seem under the circumstances to call for some more express condemnation from one who is discussing the relations of critical investigations to theological truth.

³ Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Ep. to Tim. ii. 13, 14.

when it is said that 'nothing in' our Lord's 'use of' 'the Old Testament books' 'depends on questions of authorship and date,' it is clear to us that in what our Lord says about Psalm cx. there is not only a 'question' but a real argument, and, if that is so, He pledges Himself, as we rejoice to notice Mr. Gore is now ready to admit (p. xxxiii, note 2), to the Davidic authorship of the Psalm. We are not satisfied with the repetition that the account of the Flood, though unhistorical, may have been used by our Lord as a 'representative narrative' (pp. xxxiv, xxxv). Doubtless it is representative, but, to our mind, if our Lord's warning is rightly used, a real fact is required as the type. Nor can we assent to the use that is made of undoubted truth on pp. xxxv, xxxvi. Certainly 'Christianity is a religion of a Person.' It is what it is because of the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But as 'a religion of a Person,' it, as it seems to us, requires a belief about the Bible which would not survive if the parts of *Lux Mundi* to which we formerly objected were generally accepted.

The real question at issue is: What does the New Testament require us to believe about the Old Testament? If particular opinions about the Old Testament are incompatible with what is clearly taught in the New Testament, it follows that those opinions cannot rightly be held by a Christian. Therefore, with all respect for the high office and great abilities of the Bishop of Carlisle, we must most keenly regret that in his recent Charge¹ he has deprecated any appeal on this subject to the authority of our Lord. There are many critical questions altogether outside such an appeal. The exact relationship of the Books of the Chronicles to the Books of the Kings, the authorship of some of the Psalms, the details of the method of the composition of the Pentateuch, are illustrations of such questions. But wherever our Lord has spoken on a subject, it is touched by His authority. If He ratifies, as He appears to us to ratify, the historical character of parts of Genesis, if He regards the main facts of the Mosaic legislation in very much the way in which Christians have been accustomed to regard them, if He can speak of the men of Nineveh as men who lived and repented and will rise at the last day, if He can base an argument on the Davidic authorship of a particular Psalm, it is no longer open to us to question that to which He is pledged. We are quite willing to admit as a tenable opinion that our Lord may have withheld the knowledge of some matters from His Human Nature, though it seems to us that the belief that the growth in knowledge was a growth in experience only is the more probable view, but we cannot regard it as possible that He who was personally Divine could speak otherwise than unerringly. When the Bishop of Carlisle says 'We have no right to argue . . . that He *could* not have said anything which was opposed to the truth,' we can only reply that Jesus Christ is personally God and therefore an infallible teacher.

¹ *A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese of Carlisle at his Seventh General Visitation.* By Harvey Goodwin, D.D., D.C.L., Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Lord Bishop of Carlisle. (Carlisle and London: 1890). See p. 45. This Charge was reported in the *Guardian* of July 23, 1890.

There is another passage in the same Charge which we cannot think to have been written with a full consideration of all the problems of the question.

'The Church,' it is said, 'has been taught that she rests upon Christ, in a manner which can be predicated of no other foundation. She rests upon Moses; she rests upon Apostles and Prophets; but Jesus Christ alone, in His divine and human nature, is the foundation stone. I pray you to consider and to believe that the eternal stability of this stone cannot be affected by any controversy about the Old Testament—its history, its contents, its various authorship' (p. 47).

Surely it is true that if our Lord in His teaching used the Old Testament in a way which its actual history and right interpretation would not warrant, His position as the foundation stone of the Christian Church would cease to be secure. And while without doubt 'Moses and the prophets are chiefly precious to us as leading us up to Christ' (p. 47), there are theories 'concerning the Old Testament—its history, its contents, its various authorship'—which would hardly leave us justified in regarding it as a *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*.¹ Present questions require us to be clearly discriminating; it is of the highest importance to see what is consistent with the profession of Christianity and what is not consistent. But for the supplying of this need we are not helped but hindered when it is said that no such question really affects the central faith. There must be limits somewhere to what Christians may be allowed to say about the Old Testament. To ourselves, one of those limits is supplied by the words of Christ. And here, indeed, we are not really in conflict with the writers in *Lux Mundi*. For while we differ from them as to what is necessitated on particular points by our Lord's words, and have grave fears that they have been forging weapons which may be used against both the infallibility of His teaching and the perfect goodness of His life, we must thankfully recognize they have made their own belief clear that whatever He certainly teaches He teaches infallibly.²

The whole controversy is a sad one. It has unsettled many whose minds might else have been at peace. It has caused the deepest distress to simple Christians and to skilled theologians. It has been a source of division between those who should be united in defending a common faith. All concerned in it are bound to make every possible effort to avoid unnecessary difference between Catholic Christians. But our conviction remains unchanged, that to concede to some schools of criticism the 'mythical' character of the Flood, or the non-Davidic authorship of Psalm cx., would in the end be fatal to the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation, and that a real belief in Inspiration would not long survive if it was allowed that the Books of the Chronicles are the 'idealising of history,' or the prophecies of Daniel written after the events which they profess to foretell. If we read the history of Nestorianism and Neo-Platonism aright, there is much to make us fear in ways of thought to which *Lux Mundi* is too

¹ Gal. iii. 24.

² *Lux Mundi*, pp. 359, 360, in fourth and subsequent editions; preface to tenth edition, p. xxxiii.

favourably inclined; and, therefore, while we welcome some explanations which the tenth edition affords, we are not able to modify our former opinion that the publication of parts of the book is a matter for very great regret.

Philo-Judeus: or, the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion. By JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College. (London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1890.)

THE author of this work has done good service both to Philosophy and Theology. In English Theology especially it fills a distinct gap, there being no good or at all exhaustive book on the subject. Even beside foreign works of the kind it will hold an honoured place. Principal Drummond has already proved himself an able and trustworthy writer. He looks at his subject from many sides, has a well-balanced judgment, and, what is still more important, never yields to the temptation of making what he writes tell by forced or over-rhetorical statement. This work in particular is the fruit of more than ten years' study, and the result is that he has been able to throw himself more completely into Philo's way of thinking than probably any previous writers. This is indeed the chief value of this book. If he seems to be holding a brief for Philo, it is because he has been led by the thoroughness of his study to find a richness of spiritual thought and real earnestness, where others have for the most part seen only confusion and playing at philosophy. He strongly dissents from such a verdict as that of Professor Jowett, who maintains that, though Philo's writings 'are a curious chapter in the history of the human mind, they bear only the appearance of learned trifling.' What Principal Drummond has done for himself he aims also at doing for his readers. By long and abundant extracts from Philo's works, and reference to his opinions on a large variety of details, he makes him speak for himself, and thus enables the reader to look with Philo's eyes, and to think Philo's thoughts.

There are three chief reasons given why Philo has been so frequently misunderstood and underrated. (1) His object was, not to write a systematic treatise on religious philosophy, but to give practical religious instruction. Hence his opinions have to be picked out from various parts of his voluminous works and pieced together. From this want of system there is a very real inconsistency of language, and often an apparent inconsistency of thought, and it is often only by a very careful comparison of numerous passages that Philo's real view on any particular point can be ascertained. Thus the word *ψυχή* is used sometimes of all in man which is not material, or what Philo calls the whole soul, sometimes of what he designates as 'the sovereign part of the soul,' that immortal rational element which distinguishes him from beasts. This latter Philo very frequently calls *νοῦς*, but the term is also applied to the rational faculty in the lower sense, in which it is common also to beasts. (2) Philo's constant use of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture. This is so utterly contrary to the spirit of modern exegesis that it is apt to dis-

gust the reader, and to blind him to 'the beauty of Philo's religious conceptions, and the just balance of his ethical ideals.' We are reminded that the allegorical method was not of Philo's making, but had already become characteristic of a certain school of expositors as a regular system governed by a settled code of canons. So we are told on the authority of Carl Siegfried, who with Ritter had proved a close connexion between Philo's exegesis and the Rabbinical school of Palestine. Philo employs this ready-made system for purposes of his own to defend the Scriptures from what seemed to him absurdities, and to read in his own theological conceptions. According to this method every narrative in the Pentateuch at least had an allegorical meaning. It might and generally did have a literal meaning as well, if that did not involve a manifest absurdity; as, for example, the creation of Eve in Gen. ii. 21, 22, 'which must be taken allegorically, for no one could believe that a woman was really made out of a man's rib.' (3) A third difficulty in understanding Philo is that the ideas of the age were so different from our own. On this great stress is laid, and one of the most interesting chapters in the whole book is that (bk. iii. ch. ii.) which puts before us the view of the universe as then held in Alexandria. 'If we desire,' we are told, 'to enter sympathetically into Philo's system, we must look forth upon the world with the unassisted eyes and the rude instruments of ancient Alexandria.'

The intention to introduce the reader into Philo's mental atmosphere determines the method of this work. Alexandrian philosophy originated from the blending of two very different streams of thought, the Jewish and the later Greek philosophy. In the first two books each of these is traced from its source, and some account given of their union in pre-Philonic Alexandrian literature; the third, which forms the great bulk of the work, is devoted to a careful review of the various elements of Philo's own teaching. The first book is not, however, a historical compendium of Greek Philosophy, but only a sketch of the gradual evolution of those ideas, especially that of the Logos, which had a definite place in Philo's doctrine. For the author's purpose the crude notions of Heraclitus and the doctrines of Zeno and the later Stoics are of more importance than the systems of Aristotle or even of Plato. From the latter Philo took the doctrine of ideas and applied it, in connexion with the creation, to the Divine powers, and more especially to the Logos which was, according to him, the 'idea of ideas.' From the Stoics, on the other hand, he borrowed the central conception of the Logos in the world as a sort of Divine immanence. The similar sketch of Jewish Theology from the crude anthropomorphism of the early Biblical narratives to the self-manifestations of Deity in the form or ideas of Wisdom, Word and Spirit will be very welcome just now, when the fact that Jewish Theology has a history is beginning to be duly appreciated. The greatest stress is naturally laid on the descriptions of Wisdom in Proverbs iii. 13-26, &c., and Job xxviii., in the first of which it is poetically personified, in the second poetically treated as objective. Thus the way was prepared for the later conception of Wisdom or

Word as distinct in a certain sense from God. The more elementary conceptions of Proverbs and Job were, however, according to Principal Drummond, the highest points reached in purely Jewish Scripture. Even the description of Wisdom in *Ecclus.* xxiv. did not, he maintains, add anything really new. He refutes with some warmth the view of those who, like Gförer and the late Dr. Edersheim, find in this and other parts of *Ecclesiasticus* traces of Alexandrian influence, whether due to Jesus himself or to his translator. Here it might perhaps be argued that, at all events, we do seem to find a nearer approach to the language of St. John in such passages as xxiv. 3, 8, 21, than in either Proverbs or Job. The book of the Wisdom of Solomon, on the other hand, is admitted to be evidently Alexandrian in character; and our author, who argues in favour of an early date for this book, finds in it the first example of that fusion of Jewish and Stoical ideas which was more fully developed in Philo. While the form and language are Hebraistic, 'the substance is deeply tinged with ideas borrowed directly from the Philosophic Schools.' The conception of Wisdom is said to be a necessary development of that in Proverbs. It is 'no mere attribute of God . . . and yet, on the other hand, it was not essentially separated from God, but rather belonged inseparably to the Divine essence, of which it was an extension or effluence.' This is in effect much like what our author explains as Philo's view of the Logos, except that with the latter is combined, as already said, the Platonic theory of ideas.

It is quite impossible to give any adequate idea of that part of the work which deals with Philo's views of different branches of theological and philosophic thought. It may be enough to say that the reader cannot but be struck by the minute knowledge which it shows not only of Philo's many works, but of those writers who have made him their study. The controversial character of this part of the book required an elaboration of detail which, though necessary for the writer's purpose, is rather wearisome to the reader. For example, in order to show that Philo did not conceive the Logos as personal, it was necessary to discuss a large number of passages where personal characteristics are assigned to him, and to prove, against Gförer, Keferstein, and others, that in each case the personification is either poetical or arises out of the allegorical interpretation. One of the most interesting chapters is that which deals with Philo's ethical system, where the writer is on less disputed ground.

We ought not to omit to mention the introductory chapter of this work, which gives a clear and masterly statement of Philo's character and position in Philosophy. It will be found very useful by such students as have neither the time nor the faculty for digesting the more technical details of the whole book. We have only to add a regret that the compass of the work did not allow its author to give us some account of the permanent influence of Philo on Christian thought. One cannot but be struck, in reading several of the extracts from Philo concerning the Logos, by the close similarity of thought and language between them and some parts of St. Athanasius's treatise on the Arian heresy. We hope that Principal Drummond may yet

see his way to accomplish this. Meanwhile we are grateful for what he has done. Whether we agree with him or not in detail, we must acknowledge that he has admirably succeeded in his general purpose of putting Philo before us in a way which has never been done before.

Home Reunion and the Church of Ireland. An Address delivered at the Morning Clerical Meeting held in the Metropolitan Hall, Dublin, on April 17, 1890, by the Most Rev. Lord PLUNKET, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. (Dublin: Hodges and Figgis, 1890.)

THE subject of the above address is certainly of surpassing importance. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the terms upon which our broken unity might be restored, no one who values the will and intention of our Master can fail to desire the object in itself. Whoever should be wanting in willingness to make any concession short of a sacrifice of principle for such a result would proclaim himself full of the genuine spirit of dissent, whatever his professed doctrinal position might be. We shall not yield to the Archbishop of Dublin himself in a sense of the importance of his subject, nor have we anything but thanks to give him for starting it. Moreover, though we should be sorry to trust to his sole hands the interests of the Church in a reunion congress, we can well perceive that there would be room and use for his kindly and Christian spirit to soften the collision between minds of more definite doctrine.

But there are, in company with much that is good, some reasonings in the present address which we would fain hope his Grace will reconsider in the interests of Christian reunion itself, or, what is still more important, the maintenance of existing Christian union. It were a sad result if we were to lose the love of our brethren for the sake of reconciling our opponents.

His Grace is of opinion that the Church of Ireland possesses certain facilities which the Church of England wants for dealing with the question. It is obvious that this is the case. A disestablished Church, along with its many disadvantages, possesses at least a freedom of which union with the State deprives a Church which is established. But the Archbishop thinks it necessary to add (p. 13) that 'so long as a tendency to reintroduce teaching and practices of a Romeward character continues to prevail and increase within the sister Church, so long the advance towards Home Reunion in England must proceed with leaden-weighted steps.' These are words which we read with much regret, and they indicate a tendency which might prove a great hindrance to any effective movement in the direction desired.

With regard to the Church of Rome itself, it is unfortunately the case, as the Lambeth Conference sorrowfully admits, that reunion with her seems impossible, save at the sacrifice of principle. But we would point out, not as if it were something debatable, but as a quite obvious truth, that the absence of representatives of Rome from a reunion conference ought not to mean the exclusion from its consideration of the millions of Roman Catholics and the beliefs which

they hold. It would be quite fatal at this time of day were Home Reunion to assume the character of a league against Rome; for that Church, along with all her errors, which we have no desire to minimize, represents certain great principles of Church order and truth which it better becomes us to imitate than to proscribe. Even were this otherwise she represents the deep-seated tendencies of the larger part of the Christian Church, which, in Christian charity and sense of our duty to the world, we ought not to offend.

There is no country in which this is more strikingly exemplified than in Ireland. There are in Ireland a mass of Roman Catholics, far outnumbering the Church of Ireland and all the Protestant communions together. In any serious view of the duty of that Church, or even of the duty of those other communions, the mass of Roman Catholics must be regarded as the largest part of its field. But at present it is very sad to notice the absolute impotence of Irish Protestantism to affect or to attract the multitude of their fellow-countrymen. The dissensions within the Roman communion connected with the present social agitation are not small. But it seems as if no offence that can be given them within their own Church can suffice to attract Irish Roman Catholics towards the Church of Ireland. This is certainly due to the unmitigated Protestantism which Lord Plunket (perhaps justly) considers as an advantage which the Irish Church possesses in attempting to reunite the separated Protestants. But if he could gather into one room the representatives of all these bodies, how would he think and encourage them to think of the Romans outside? There is—and we are sure he will allow it—only one way of thinking of them which would be Christian and true—namely, as an unrepresented majority whose interests ought to be the more carefully attended to because they are unrepresented, in the same way as the unreformed British Parliament ought to have attended to the interest of the unrepresented masses; but it did not. The day may well come, under changed social circumstances, in which the Church of Ireland may have more power with the mass of those whom she claims as her subjects than she has now; and if his Grace were to succeed in welding together all the Protestants, at the cost of exaggerating that opposition which now impresses the Roman Catholics with so general a belief that Protestantism is no real religion at all, he would have sacrificed the greater good to the less.

There cannot be a better example of the error committed by an ecclesiastical conference in neglecting the spiritual wants of those not represented in it than is afforded by the Church of Rome itself. The Vatican Council found itself so free from the presence of any representatives of modern science and criticism that with only some slight coercion of a small minority of its members it was able to consolidate a mighty union on the basis of the extremest Ultramontanism. No doubt this gave it the strength which a garrison gains from expelling the citizens. But it was neither righteous, nor prudent, nor Catholic, in the highest sense of those terms. The comprehension of ideas is more important for any purpose of reunion, either home or foreign, than the comprehension of persons, and instead of thinking it a help

to a reunion movement that it included none who understood and viewed with charity the religion of Rome, we should consider it as great a misfortune as it was to the Vatican Council to have none in it who could speak for Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon thought.

Archbishop Plunket quotes with approval in his appendix a paper read in the London Presbyterian College which contains much that is attractive and wise, but also a thoroughgoing invective against sacerdotalism as, in company with establishment, the absolute bar to Home Reunion. But what in the world *is* sacerdotalism? Does it mean the practical recognition of the Divine institution of the Christian ministry? If so there never can be true reunion upon the basis of the rejection of a doctrine which is not only embodied in the formularies both of the Churches of England and Ireland, but in some form or other is recognized by every religious body which uses ordination. Does it mean any peculiar exaggerations by individuals or parties through pride or narrowness of mind, of the position and claims of the ministry? These are not causes distinct enough or permanent enough to be spoken of as a bar to reunion, and they are just as apt in their way to exist among Low Churchmen and Dissenters as among the so-called Ritualists. We venture to say that it is not among the last-named class that objections would be most likely to arise to any concessions in non-essential points for the purpose of bringing in the Nonconformists. The Ritualists are not people addicted to a cast-iron conservatism. They are well accustomed to the notion of living in the same Church with persons whose doctrines and practices are very different from their own. That is the very condition of things which they want to establish in their own case, and which they find their brethren of the Low Church disposed very vehemently to resist. Nor is there any class of the clergy who live in more peace and harmony and mutual respect with religious Dissenters than do the Ritualists. On the whole we believe that the sooner his Grace divests the movement in which he is interested of the spirit which appears in the remarks on which we have commented the better will it be for its success.

The positive part of his Grace's plan is scarcely before us in so definite a form as to enable us to comment upon it. We do not think him prudent in reviving from the nominally secret history of the Lambeth Conference the remembrance of Bishop Barry's proposals. He thinks to derive some comfort for those who regard non-episcopal orders as valid or half-valid from the resolution of the committee of the Conference to that effect combined with the fact that while the report was not accepted the Conference made no declaration against it. The rejection of the resolution, with the insertion of the claims of the historic episcopate among the necessary bases of reunion, would seem to us as strong an intimation of its judgment as the Conference could well have made.

But it is not necessary for the Archbishop to advance such debatable arguments as this in order to introduce his proposal, which, though not, as we have said, very definite, yet is shadowed out in the following words: 'The Lambeth Conference's resolutions re-

quire, no doubt, the episcopal ordination of all who may enter the ministry in the future, but the question as to the re-ordination of existing ministers of unepiscopal communions is distinctly left open.' We really cannot conceive why if the claims of the historic episcopate may be deemed consistent with the recognition of non-episcopal ordination in the present generation, they might not also be extended to the admission of similar ordinations in the future. But if any separated body would come in to us—or, if they chose to put it so, would permit us to go to them—on the basis of the episcopal ordination of all future ministers, why should we be called upon to make any recognition of the non-episcopal ministry, which would be waxing old and ready to vanish away, further than as a state of things which very excellent Christian men, worthy of our highest love and respect, have established, and which we are unable for the present to change? We should recognize it not as something which ought to be, but merely as something which is.

That point having been once arranged, the question would come, What varieties in worship, ritual, and symbolic formularies should be afforded to the Uniates? And here we should be in favour of the very largest concessions consistent with the maintenance of the Catholic faith and the ministration of the sacraments according to the Lord's institution. We should make them, we confess, with the firm belief that in a free field, and with the fences of prejudice even partially broken down by the act of union and the discussions preceding it, Catholic doctrine and practice would finally triumph by their own inherent worthiness. If our reunited brethren hoped the same for their doctrine and practice we could not complain. The law of God and of history would prevail in the survival of the fittest.

1. *Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia, including the complete Collation, throughout the Inferno, of all the MSS. at Oxford and Cambridge.* By the Rev. EDWARD MOORE, D.D., Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and Barlow Lecturer on Dante in the University of London. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1889.)
2. *La Commedia di Dante Alighieri.* (London: Rivington, 1890.)
3. *Dante's Inferno, Purgatorio, and Paradiso.* Translated into Greek Verse by Musurus Pasha, D.C.L. Second Edition. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1890.)

1. DR. MOORE'S work is a monument of patient research and scholarly discrimination. Of the total number of MSS. of the *Divina Commedia* known to exist (between five and six hundred) he has examined nearly half. To denote these he has to employ, in addition to numerals up to 119, the greater part of the Greek and English alphabets, both in capitals and small letters, and (in the case of the English) also in italics. As he says, the references to these MSS. throughout his book are to be counted by thousands and even tens of thousands, and the correction of the press alone must on that account have been an herculean toil. He has also brought to bear

on his task the study of the works, many of them most voluminous, of more than sixty commentators and writers upon Dante, in addition to references to the eighteen earliest commentators, and to the unpublished commentaries of Guido Pisano and Serravalle.

Full justice cannot be done to the result of such labours as these within the compass of a notice. Nor indeed would a lengthy article suffice for the purpose. From the necessity of the case the book is full throughout of the discussion of details, and must itself be studied at length for its due appreciation. But we may do our readers some service by setting before them a précis of Dr. Moore's *Prolegomena*, that they may understand what he set himself to do; what were the difficulties in his way; and how far he can claim to have surmounted them.

After pointing out that not a stroke of Dante's handwriting is in existence, that there is no dated MS. professing to be older than 1335 or 1336, and that certainly false readings, so ancient as nearly to be contemporary with Dante himself, are numerous, he propounds to himself the problem of getting behind the 'Lezione volgata' (which Witte tells us was already instituted about the middle of the fourteenth century, and of which no existing MS. is independent), and thus reconstructing the extinct original. In attempting the solution of this problem the textual critic, he says, must bear in mind the axiomatic principle that he has to determine not what reading may seem to him the most clear and elegant, but what his author is most likely to have written.¹ He finds himself confronted by nine classes or causes of corruption of the text. These are: (1) The introduction by the various copyists of Dialectic Varieties. From these the place where a particular MS. was written can often be determined. A large preponderance exhibit Venetian or Lombardo-Venetian peculiarities. (2) The 'Personal Equation' of the writer, shown by his preference for certain forms of words or inflexions; the vulgar insertion of the initial aspirate; the modernization of proper names. (3) Variation of the order of words for the sake of euphony or uniformity with other passages, or from considerations of rhythm and scansion. (4) Ignorance in the copyist of uncommon words, inflexions, or idioms. (5) His ignorance or impatience of involved and lengthy constructions. (6) His general misunderstanding of the meaning or point of a passage. (7) Tamperings with the text in the supposed interests of orthodoxy—an instance of which is the substitution of 'porta' for 'parte' in *Inf.* iv. 36—'parte' seeming to assign too subordinate a position to the Sacrament of Baptism. (8) Blunders of eye or of ear, or reproduction of mere clerical errors; the largest class of all. (9) The incorporation or conflation of marginal glosses, e.g. 'Virgilio' for (the true reading) 'in ver lui' in *Inf.* xii. 16, 'Lachesi' for (the true) 'lei che di' in *Purg.* xxi. 25.

¹ There is a glaring instance of violation of this principle in the reason given by Scartazzini for the admission into his text of the reading 'nom fia' in *Par.* xvii. 135. We believe that to be the true reading, but Scartazzini adopts it simply because he considers it a happy emendation. 'A noi questa lezione sembra una correzione, ma una correzione *felice* perchè l'abbiamo accettata anche noi nel testo.'

To these must be added the possibility that Dante himself introduced changes by way of revision, doubtful though this is.

When all these causes had been in operation on the text for two centuries, it was, Dr. Moore plaintively remarks, subjected after the invention of printing to a fresh visitation of editors and grammatical purists.

How then to recover, at all events approximately, the original text? Dr. Moore points out the futility of such methods as reliance on (a) the antiquity of a MS. as a guarantee of the purity of its text; (b) the numerical support afforded by MSS. to one reading or another; (c) the estimation of a MS. by taking from it a few passages selected as test ones, not for their critical value but at hap-hazard.

The true method, as advocated by Witte, is the gradual collation and publication of all the variations of MSS. from some standard, excepting those of mere orthography or accident. Dr. Moore seeks to pursue this by printing (with Witte's permission accorded in his lifetime), as a first-fruits of his researches, the text of the *Inferno* as established by Witte from four well-known MSS., and by collating with it seventeen further MSS. examined by himself. He economised the labour of examining the MSS. on the principle of 'natural selection' with a view to the 'survival of the fittest.' There were two ways of doing this: (1) by tracing the genealogical relationship of all the MSS., and then examining such only as appear to be, in Witte's words, 'the patriarchs of the family;' and (2) by estimating the intrinsic value of individual MSS. by a series of carefully selected test passages. Dr. Moore rejected the first of these, though regretfully, as altogether impracticable. He, and we think rightly, greatly prefers the second, which he adopted, to Witte's plan of collating a single canto—*Inf.* iii. was the one he selected—in more than 400 MSS. This, it is true, enabled Witte to construct a provisional first class of MSS. containing twenty-two members, additional to the four on which he based his text of the whole poem. But, as Dr. Moore says, the value of this result is much impaired by the consideration that it might have been reversed had some other single canto been chosen as a basis of comparison, seeing that one and the same MS. exhibits very different characters of text not only in different Cantiche, but even in different cantos of the same Cantica, and this both in intrinsic merit and in the relationships it indicates with other MSS. Whereas, by Dr. Moore's method of examining a well-sifted and carefully prepared list of test passages, two or more rival readings could be definitely stamped on recognized critical principles as primary, or secondary and derivative. Thus, a MS. which most often exhibited the original and comparatively seldom the derivative readings, might be presumed to contain a text little tampered with; and the cumulative support of such MSS. to a reading otherwise indeterminate would exalt that reading to something like certainty.

Dr. Moore then lays down that two steps were necessary for working out his plan in detail, viz.: (1) To establish and illustrate the 'à priori critical principles' by which to be guided in the selection of the test passages; and (2) to apply these to make the definite

sel
pas
Th
(W
the
tes
sel
rea
nat
exi
ori
sist
in
for
of
the
an
bec
enc
Th
IV
esp
the
Ov
in
of
Da
for

mu
his
ter
ref
hav
om
cer
by
tra
pro
the
wh
Fl
exa
sea
say
wit
Ho

of
into

selection required. And he subdivides the list so obtained into passages (a) practically certain, and (b) only more or less probable. Then follows a statement of the general critical principles in question. (We speak under correction, but would remark, *en passant*, that these appear to us to be adapted not so much for the selection of test passages as for the determination of the true reading of any one selected passage.) They are as follows :—I. If one out of various readings would, supposing it to be prior in existence to the rest, naturally account for the genesis of the others, whereas their prior existence would not account for *its* genesis, it is probably true and original. II. *Difficilior lectio potior* : taking a *difficilior lectio* to consist in such details as the occurrence of a *word* or *expression* strange in itself or in the sense implied ; of a word of unusual or archaic *form* ; of an apparently unnatural or uneuphonious *order* of words ; of a long, complicated, or grammatically anomalous *construction of the sentence*. This is only a special application of Principle I., because an out-of-the-way reading is more likely to have preceded than to have been evolved from a simpler one. III. The consistency or inconsistency of rival readings with sentiments elsewhere expressed by Dante. Thus, Giuliani insisted that Dante must be 'spiegato con Dante.'¹ IV. The imitation or reminiscence by Dante of passages in earlier, especially classical, authors, known to have been familiar to him, e.g. the Bible in the Vulgate, Aristotle (in a Latin translation), Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, and Boethius. V. The relation which a reading bears in respect of truth or falsehood, accuracy or inaccuracy, to questions of historical fact involved in a passage ; bearing in mind how far Dante may be deemed to have been himself rightly or wrongly informed as to such facts.

III., IV., and V. are minor considerations, says Dr. Moore. We must refer our readers to his Prolegomena (beginning at p. xl.), for his indication of the applicability of all five Principles to the counteraction of the nine classes or causes of corruption of the text before referred to. Also for his summary of the results which he claims to have established or confirmed by his labours. But we must not omit his important conclusion that it seems possible to construct certain well-marked groups or families of MSS. such as that styled by Witte 'The Sienese ;' and his assurance that he has himself traced distinctly another, which he describes as 'The Vatican,' its prototype being the second of Witte's selected MSS., No. 3199 in the Vatican Library, and to which he devotes an appendix. To those who may be disposed to follow in his steps, he points out that Florence alone contains more than 200 MSS., of which he has only examined about a third. But, as the result of his indefatigable researches there and elsewhere, he has, as he is well warranted in saying, 'enabled any student to work out many textual problems without the labour of visiting numerous libraries in various countries.' How many and how wide apart are the libraries visited by Dr.

¹ Dr. Moore warns us, in a note, to distinguish between discrepancies of sentiment and deliberate changes of opinion by Dante ; and gives an interesting list of the latter.

Moore, may be seen at a glance by reference to his list (pp. 680-5) of the MSS. which he has collated or examined. And anyone who peruses his minute account of these MSS. (pp. 509-679), will be ready to exclaim that in them Dr. Moore 'studia sì, che pare ai lor vivagni.'

Of the five disquisitions in the Appendix, the most valuable, we think, is the fourth, 'On the text of Witte's Berlin Edition,' giving us, as it does, the few corrections in that text which in Dr. Moore's matured judgment are required. But a word of praise is due to the fifth, 'On the Metre of the *Divina Commedia*,' written by the Rev. H. F. Tozer, Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College.

We must not conclude without calling the special attention of all students of Dante to Dr. Moore's 'Collation and Discussion of selected Passages' (pp. 255-507). It will be in the power of few to become fellow-delivers with him in the mine which he has worked so well; but many are competent to test the pure ore of approved readings which he has brought to bank. We ourselves go almost entirely with him both in his selection and in his interpretation of each of them; although, did space permit, we might instance a few as to his rendering of which there may fairly be a difference of judgment.

We have noticed one misprint. In *Inf.*, xii. 100 (p. 85), for 'novemmo' read 'movemmo.'

2. It is easy to make a shrewd guess at the identity of the unnamed editor of the text of the *Divina Commedia* published by Messrs. Rivington.

He tells us in a brief Italian preface that although in these last years the study of the divine poem among us *extremos Britannos* has taken a very notable development, it does not appear to have occurred to any one, down to the present time, to give students an edition of the text founded on the results of most recent criticism; and that the present volume is an attempt to satisfy this want. He adds that in preparing and revising the text he has naturally relied in the first instance on Witte's edition, but has, nevertheless, in a few passages where the latter seemed to have followed too closely his four codici, not hesitated to admit variants supported by a preponderance of authority, or required by the general sense.

It may be an open question whether we *extremi Britanni* were conscious of the want here suggested: whether we should not have remained content with Witte's text, purged as it has been by subsequent commentators of the few undoubted errors which it contains, such e.g. as 're Giovanni' for 're giovane' in *Inf.* xxvii. 135; 'sitiò' for 'sitiunt' in *Purg.* xxii. 6; 'Dante' for 'Da te' in *Par.* xxvi. 104. The few passages in addition to these corrections, in which, what we will call the Rivington text varies from Witte's, hardly constitute, we think, a sufficient *raison d'être* for it. Others might have paused where Dr. Moore feared to tread. He, in the appendix which he devotes to Witte's text in his *Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia* (p. 711), after saying that he has been continually more impressed with its general excellence and its quite exceptional

position among all other editions, ancient and modern, tells us that but for its existence he should have been led to propose either the construction of a new text or a very considerable purifying of those now current; but that, inasmuch as he found that his results generally tended to confirm Dr. Witte's selections in the case of disputed readings, he contented himself with making a list of the principal cases in which it appeared to him to be desirable to modify that text. This list he gives us, and it contains a total of 47 corrections only in the whole poem—22 in the *Inferno*, 12 in the *Purgatorio*, and 13 in the *Paradiso*. We find that the Rivington text adopts 9 of these in the *Inferno*, 6 in the *Purgatorio*, and 11 in the *Paradiso*. We presume that the editor disagrees with Dr. Moore as to the remainder. We by no means say that he is wrong in so doing; indeed we doubt whether both he and Dr. Moore are not wrong in at least one proposed variant in which they agree. We refer to their reading 'or tonda, or *altra* schiera' in place of Witte's 'or tonda, or *lunga* schiera' in *Par.* xviii. 75. 'Altra' is here a feeble and pointless word in comparison with 'lunga,' which moreover, is strongly supported by *Par.* xxx. 89, 90 ('mi parve Di sua *lunghezza* divenuta tonda'); and by *Inf.* v. 47 ('Facendo in aer di sè *lunga* riga'), where birds (as here) are the subject of description. On the other hand, we think Dr. Moore is clearly right, though in this he is not supported by the Rivington editor, and also exposes himself to the scorn of Scartazzini, in suggesting 'la mia' for 'la mano' in *Inf.* xv. 29. We have collated the Rivington text with that of Witte throughout the *Inferno*, and find them differ in eleven instances only—that is to say, in two more than the nine in which the Rivington and Dr. Moore are in accord.¹ If, as we may fairly infer, the differences are no more, if not less, numerous in the other two *Cantiche*, we are all the more confirmed in our conclusion that Witte's supremacy might have been left undisturbed.

It is to be regretted that in printing the mere text without a word of annotation, no means can be found for calling attention to questions of disputed punctuation. As Dr. Moore remarks (p. 26) in a note to *Inf.* iv. 57, 58, where he discusses the punctuation of those lines suggested by Zani de' Ferranti, 'the MSS. of course, do not help us on such a point as this.' But none the less, it is a point which in frequent instances has given rise to the keenest disputation. Especially has this been the case with respect to the *terzina* at *Par.* xxv. 88–90. And although the punctuation there in the Rivington text follows Witte's, we venture to think that so far from being 'founded on the results of most recent criticism,' it has been conclusively overthrown by that of Lelio Arbib.

¹ These two are *Inf.* i. 4, 'Eh' (Witte), 'E' (Rivington); and 28, 'Poi ch' ei' (Witte), 'Poiche' (Rivington). Of course we do not count as variants such discrepancies as occur in the spelling of proper names, e.g. 'Lancelotto' (W.), 'Lancilotto' (R.), 'Opizzo' (W.), 'Obizzo' (R.); or in the substitution of the final vowel for an apostrophe in such words as 'ai,' 'coi,' 'dei,' 'nei,' 'sei' (R.) in place of 'a',' 'co',' 'de',' 'ne',' 'se' (W.)

We must also express our regret that a different mode of heading the pages and numbering the lines of the poem was not followed in this book. The abbreviated title of the *Cantica*, and the number of the canto, are printed in small type at the extreme right hand corner at the top of each left page, and the numbers of the lines contained in both it and the opposite page are indicated in the extreme left hand corner at the top of that page, merely by joining with a hyphen the number of the first line on the left with that of the last line on the opposite page. This, no doubt, gives an æsthetic appearance to the pages, but it necessitates the use of an additional text by anyone who wishes to save himself from the certainty of much trouble, and the risk of frequent inaccuracy, in searching for and quoting any line or passage.

3. The second edition of Musurus Pasha's translation into Greek verse of the *Divina Commedia*, issued in the compendious form of one volume instead of the original three, and thus brought, as he says in his preface, more within the reach of the οἱ πολλοί, is not only a welcome proof of the interest in the poem which must be felt by his compatriots, but is also a literary curiosity which most English Dantophilists will wish to possess.

With regard to the metre which he has chosen, and of which he says in his preface to the first edition of the *Inferno*—or rather, ΑΔΟΥ—that it is dodecasyllabic and paroxyton, resembling the Iambic but wanting in its chronic rhythm, we think that, however, 'οἱ νῦν ἐλλογιζόμενοι' may reconcile themselves to the disregard of 'longs and shorts,' in which he admits it to abound, the English reader's first impression will be, that line after line is struggling to be an iambic trimeter, while it violates in the attempt every rule of that metre. The great majority of them do not bear the smallest resemblance to iambics. Many, which have an approximate likeness to them, fail because the 'stable spondees' will not conform to the terms upon which alone the iambic will tolerate their society.¹ The few genuine iambics which we meet with at wide intervals are *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. They come to the surface of the prosaic medium in which they are swimming, as clogged as were the stray Peculators, who from time to time showed themselves at the top of the boiling pitch in the fifth bolgia; and like them are lost to view 'in men che non balena.' Let us take three instances, one from each *Cantica*, of passages beginning with a pure iambic line, but followed by others of the ordinary type of the Pasha's metre.

Inf. xxxi. 79-81:—

Ἐώμεν αὐτόν, μηδ' ὀμιλῶμεν μάτην·
Πᾶσα γὰρ γλῶσσα πρὸς αὐτόν ἐστιν οὕτως,
Ὡς ἡ τοῦτου πρὸς ἄλλους, ἄγνωστος πᾶσιν.

¹ Spondeos stabiles in jura paterna recepit,
Commodus et patiens, non ut de sede secundā
Cederet aut quartā socialiter.

Horace, *Ars Poet.* 256-258

Purg. xvii. 49-51 :—

Τοσοῦτον δ' ἐν ἐμβαλοῦσά μοι πόθον
Τοῦ γνῶναι, τίς ἦν ὁ προσφθεγγόμενός με,
Ὅστ' οὐ ποτ' ἂν παύσαιτο πρὶν ἂν προσβλέψω.

Par. xiii. 136-138 :—

Καὶ πλοῖον εἶδον ὠκέως καὶ οὐρίας
Τρέχον ἐπὶ θαλάσσης δι' ὅλου δρόμου,
Ἄλλ' ἐν εἰσόδῳ λυμένος ναυαγῆσαν.

We must not be understood to imply any censure in the foregoing remarks. We only say that we cannot but regret that it was doubtless impossible for the translator to use the true iambic metre.

Apart from the metre we find much to admire. The translation is line for line, and is very close to the original, although here and there a word is left untranslated, as in *Inf.* xxxii. 4, 5, where 'Io premerei di mio concetto il suco Più pienamente' is rendered τὴν διάνοιαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἂν ἐδήλουν Πληρέστερον, and Dante's figure of 'pressing out the juice' of his conception is omitted. So again οἰωνοὺς αἰσίους is not an adequate rendering of 'lor maggior fortuna' in *Purg.* xix. 4. The Greek language is perhaps the one of all others the best adapted to reproduce the terse antithetic style of the divine Poet. We have not space for more than one selection out of the many which might be made to show the singular felicity with which, for instance, the Italian inflections of one same word are caught and retained by the translator :—

O luce eterna, che sola in te sidi,
Sola t' intendi, e da te intelletta
Ed intendente, te ami ed arridi !

*Ὡ φῶς ἄφθιτον, ἐν σαυτῷ μόνον μένον,
Αὐτὸ μόνον ἐννοοῦν, ἀπὸ σαυτοῦ τε
Νοοῦμενον καὶ νοοῦν, σαυτῷ τε χαίρον !

Par. xxxiii. 124-126.

The only fault we have to find here is that the last three words of the Greek version are hardly an equivalent for 'te ami ed arridi.' All the rest of it deserves unqualified praise.

The exigencies of the Greek alphabet must have proved very trying to the Pasha, when casting about how to put the numerous proper names scattered all over the *Divina Commedia* into Greek form. We at first hardly recognize Virgil and Varro in their Greek equivalents, Βιργίλιος, Βαρρών. And we require time to identify in Κασσαγίδας, Βαλγριεύη, Βονανεντούρας, Cacciaguida, Valdigreve, and Bonaventura. Occasionally we come upon a change of quantity in one of the syllables of a name : e.g. Romēna and Forēse become Ῥωμένα and Φορέσης. The sixteenth canto of the *Paradiso* may be selected as a crucial test of the difficulties of nomenclature which had to be surmounted.

We have not been able to dip into the notes, but we gather from the preface to the first edition that these are mostly derived from those to the late Sir Frederick Pollock's translation. And though we have not collated the present edition with the first, we give the

Pasha full credit for his assurance that he has introduced into it several βελτιώσεις, both as to translation and as to conformity with approved readings in the original text.

Memorials of the Life of George Elwes Corrie, D.D., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; Rector of Newton in the Isle; Sometime Norrisian Professor in the University of Cambridge. Drawn principally from his Diary and Correspondence. Edited by M. HOLROYD. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1890.)

WE suppose that the experience recorded in these Memorials must be unique in University annals, for Dr. Corrie's residence at Cambridge exceeded man's allotted period of threescore years and ten. Corrie entered in his twenty-first year at Catharine Hall in September 1813, and died at Jesus College Lodge in the same month of 1885, having passed the whole of that long interval, after taking his B.A. degree, successively as tutor, fellow, professor, and head. Besides the ordinary opportunity, afforded by so protracted a career, of association with interesting persons and events, the subject of this book was brought into contact in turn with all University men who were destined to take holy orders; he was for many years the acknowledged leader of the Conservative party in Cambridge; and he was gifted with a piquancy of opinions and of phrase in giving them expression which gave him marked distinction amongst a body of men who were sufficiently varied in talent and tone. Here, then, were all the materials for a biography of exceptional interest. Possibly we entertained undue expectations, but we confess to a sense of disappointment in reading it, which we find it somewhat difficult to justify. It may be that the even tenor of so good a man's life presents difficulties of artistic presentation which the editor of the Memorials has not the genius to overcome.

Corrie's early years were spent in a typical English country parsonage. Simple living and high thinking prevailed at Colsterworth, which his father held with two other benefices. Two elder brothers took orders, of whom one, Daniel, became Bishop of Madras, and the other, Henry, rector of Kettering. The future Norrisian Professor's persistent fondness for sport was indulged yet judiciously guided by his father, whose training seems to have been singularly calculated to inculcate and elicit honour and high-mindedness. Knowing George's fondness for horses, he begged him never to go to Newmarket: a request which was scrupulously regarded, but about the observance of which the father never questioned his son. 'Don't make sport the business of your life; after all, the keeper will always be a better shot,' was another parental maxim which many sons would do well to remember. As an undergraduate, Corrie gained the goodwill of Turton, who was then tutor of Catharine Hall; and this friendship, which remained unbroken until Bishop Turton's death in 1864, exercised a most important influence on Corrie's subsequent fortunes.

A few glimpses from bygone days shine out in the extracts quoted from Corrie's diary. In 1836 a young civil engineer em-

ployed at Cambridge on the construction of a railway from London northwards gives it as his opinion that 'it would prove a bubble and would never pay.' The name of this unhappy prophet is mercifully suppressed. At the Proclamation of Queen Victoria by the mayor some radical Masters of Arts joined the cavalcade on horseback *in their gowns*. In 1838 Corrie attends a lecture at the Adelaide Gallery on making gas for lighting the streets, and a subsequent entry records its adoption in the College Chapel. Towards the close of the same year a game of football on Parker's Piece astonishes by its *novelty*. At the presentation of the address on the Queen's accession some persons were intoxicated *in the very Presence Chamber* (p. 136). A year later it is proposed to try and induce the undergraduates to stand up during the singing at St. Mary's instead of sitting, as was then customary. Such illustrations are, however, extremely rare, and it would be difficult probably to read a biography of similar length which sheds so little light upon the manners and customs of its times.

The truth is that the editor of these Memorials has concentrated all her attention upon the solitary figure of Dr. Corrie, whose life stands out in naked realism without any of the perspective supplied by well-drawn accessories. That life, as here presented, was one of persevering and conscientious performance of every duty. The work which each day brought was accomplished in the spirit of the maxim 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.' It had not been young Corrie's intention to remain at Cambridge after taking his degree, but immediately upon the appearance of his name as eighteenth wrangler he was offered a share in the College tuition by Dr. Turton; and he at once showed that he was well qualified to fill the post. 'He called together those who had been his companions, and, pointing out to them how difficult it would be for him to exercise any discipline over them, made an appeal to their honour, which met with a cordial and practical response.' As tutor and dean he knew how to combine the maintenance of discipline with a kindness and sympathy that endeared him to the undergraduates of his College. No man could give a more unsparing rebuke, and no man knew better how to distinguish between mere indiscretion and intentional misdoing. He took a lively interest in the younger men's pursuits, and the choice of a dog was always referred to him. On one occasion, when a noisy party had not at once dispersed at his direction, he went in person to the room, where the guests hastily concealed themselves under the table. He requested the host to retire to bed, and said he would not ask for the names of those who owned the legs and arms he saw protruding. Sixty years later men retained a vivid remembrance of his unflinching kindness and thoughtful counsel. Work at Cambridge was diversified by clerical assistance given to his brother, whose parsonage at Kettering was generally his vacation home. A serious attack of hæmorrhage from the lungs, in his thirty-ninth year, prevented his attendance for two years on his University duties, and enforced the necessity of scrupulous regard for health for a much longer period.

Corrie's theological standpoint was mainly that of the orthodox Anglican divines, with more or less leaning to the Evangelical party. His hatred of Romanism was intense, and remained unmitigated to the last. He regarded Roman Catholics as aliens, the subjects of a foreign power, essentially and inevitably hostile to the Church of England, whose welfare was the one object nearest his heart. Of mere ignorant declamation on this or on any subject he was characteristically impatient. 'It will be well,' he caustically remarks, 'if preachers read before they write and speak ;' but he regarded Roman error on the doctrine of Justification as fundamental and deadly. These convictions were strengthened by a tour in France and Switzerland in 1821, and by several visits to Ireland, where all the efforts of his friends the O'Briens of Blatherwyck were neutralized by the influence of the priests, about whom he makes complaints such as are now daily re-echoed in Unionist journals. On the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 dark days seemed in store for the Church, and Corrie's temperament was not sanguine ; his chief thought was stoutly to uphold principles, and to fall, if fall we must, with dignity. Admission of Dissenters to the Universities, Roman Catholic Emancipation, Royal Commissions of inquiry, and their consequent proposals of interference with episcopal and cathedral property, made his blood boil as un-English usurpations, to which he never became reconciled. As Vice-Chancellor he firmly declined to answer any inquiry addressed to him by the Commission of 1850. To another set of queries, including the question 'What do you think your College most requires ?' he replied : 'I respectfully suggest it most needs to be left alone.'

These idiosyncrasies, however, were but bubbles on the current of a life passed in the constant and consistent pursuit of every good work. Dr. Corrie was engaged in the furtherance of all that could promote the spiritual growth of the Church—the higher education of the clergy, the strengthening and extension of her missions at home and abroad. His efforts as a parish priest and as rural dean resulted in an entire change throughout a part of the diocese of Ely, which Bishop Turton had declared he never thought of without pain. As years rolled on his sphere of influence extended, and there is hardly a name of note at Cambridge for the last half-century which does not appear in the circle of his attached friends. Many were those who turned to him for advice ; and perhaps the most valuable part of the Memorials is that which contains the sterling and well-read good sense with which he maintained the Church position and satisfied many a morbid scruple. Beneath all lay a deep spring of genuine humility and personal devotion to his Master. His mind was cast in a rather narrow mould. He had in him something of the Puritan strain. To a political or religious adversary he was at times rather less than just. He allowed practices for which we can find no valid plea, and in the fervour of his Protestantism he misunderstood and opposed measures which have proved of great service to the Church. But no one can rise from the story of his life without recognizing that he was a good man : made of the stuff that has given marrow and backbone to the Church of England.

The Composition of the Four Gospels: a Critical Enquiry. By the Rev. ARTHUR WRIGHT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

THOUGH the title-page of this book speaks of the four Gospels, its contents are in fact confined to the three Synoptists, the Gospel of St. John being dismissed in a single short chapter, which does not argue out any of the questions connected with it. As regards the main portion of the work, the degree of acceptance which any reader is likely to give to its method and conclusions will depend largely on the extent to which he accepts the author's views on Inspiration. The central principle of Mr. Wright's book is contained in the saying that 'Inspiration does not supersede or materially alter the laws of human thought' (p. 29). No one who refuses to submit the documents on which the Christian faith historically rests to the full light of criticism will derive the smallest profit or satisfaction from this treatise. On the other hand, those who believe that criticism can only be rendered harmless by being met by criticism, and that the foundations of the faith are strengthened, not weakened, by the process, will find it both instructive and suggestive.

Probably no critic who is even moderately endowed with the gift of historical imagination, refuses at the present day to assent to the position that the common basis of our Synoptic Gospels is, in the main, oral tradition. This alone accounts satisfactorily for the similarities and divergencies of the three narratives. Mr. Wright accordingly takes this as his foundation, and attempts to reconstruct the process by which our Gospels were built up. The central portion he holds to consist of the 'Petrine memoirs,' originally delivered orally by St. Peter in Aramaic, translated for the benefit of the Greek synagogues by St. Mark, and written down some years later, after they had been universally adopted by the catechists as their staple of instruction, by St. Mark himself. This 'first cycle' is substantially identical with St. Mark's Gospel as we have it now, which consequently represents the central and most authoritative tradition of the life of Christ. The 'second cycle' comprises the 'Utterances of Our Lord,' a collection of discourses and parables compiled by St. Matthew. St. Matthew's Gospel was written originally in Aramaic by a catechist working under St. Matthew's direction, who combined the Petrine memoirs with the collection of which the apostle was himself the author. This was (except for some later accretions of unauthorised matter) the Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which we hear in the early Fathers, and was probably composed before the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. Meanwhile the sections of the 'second cycle' had been translated into Greek as soon as they were composed, and had continued to circulate orally, until, shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, some Greek catechist formed out of them and the Petrine memoirs our first Gospel, which thus substantially agreed with St. Matthew's Aramaic Gospel without being a translation from it. The 'third cycle' of oral Gospel was never current in the East, and was compiled by some unknown author of Pauline tendencies.

St. Luke had this cycle before him as well as the two already described; and his Gospel is composed of selections from all three, together with a few details not contained in any of them, and some portions (such as the first two chapters) which never circulated orally at all. All three Greek Gospels were written between A.D. 70 and 80, St. Mark's being the earliest, St. Luke's perhaps the latest.

This is a brief outline of Mr. Wright's theory, and those who are acquainted with the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels will know the main arguments by which it is supported. The work is constructive, not controversial; Mr. Wright rarely mentions the theories or the arguments of other critics, but contents himself with stating his own position positively. With the general outline of his work, as to the creation of our Gospels out of a system of oral tradition, we agree. It is the natural method of transmission in the time and circumstances under which Christianity arose, and it is perfectly intelligible that different groups of incidents or discourses should hang together, so as to form several 'cycles' or groups of tradition, which might eventually be formed, separately or in combination, into written narratives. It is here that the office of Inspiration appears, causing those portions of the tradition of our Lord's life to be preserved which were most needful for us to know, and guiding the composers of the written Gospels in the selection and accurate treatment of their material. As to the exact details of the composition of our Gospels, however, it is hopeless to expect to arrive at complete knowledge, and neither Mr. Wright nor anyone else can construct a history of the process which is not largely imaginary and uncertain. Into these details we cannot enter here; it would require a whole treatise to discuss them all; and where so much rests on a purely subjective basis, no satisfactory conclusion can be expected. Mr. Wright would, however, have smoothed the course of his argument if he had refrained from *obiter dicta* on various matters of controversy, which carry no weight and only provoke criticism. Such are his assertions that the parables of the Talents and the Pounds are almost certainly versions of the same parable (p. 148), or his description of the several orders in the primitive Church (pp. 8-13). Another characteristic which is liable to cause misconstruction is the manner in which the 'deterioration' of the oral tradition is insisted on, and the way in which the 'second' and 'third' cycles are spoken of as if they had only come into existence many years after our Lord's death. If we were to suppose that any extensive deterioration had taken place in the record before it was committed to writing, or that the discourses of our Lord were composed thirty years after His death, our faith in the accuracy of our knowledge of His life and teaching must be seriously weakened. Mr. Wright does not, we think, intend to maintain either of these views, but his language in some places seems liable to suggest them.

Mr. Wright has tried to follow too minutely the process of the composition of the Gospels, and has occasionally been led into improbabilities. For instance, he ascribes the meagreness of the first cycle to the fact that St. Peter left Jerusalem before he had completed the course of his teaching on which that cycle was based (pp.

22, 23); yet on the same page he tells us that his departure did not take place till twelve years after the Ascension, a length of time which would have been amply sufficient for the delivery of a far longer course of instruction than that which is recorded in the 'Petrine memoirs.' This, however, belongs to that class of details which rest on pure conjecture, and as to which certainty is impossible. The volume, as a whole, is able and suggestive, and there is no question as to the author's earnestness in his belief that criticism of this character does nothing to weaken the authority of the Gospels. It is certainly true that even if his conclusions, which some persons may think dangerously revolutionary, be accepted in full, the main facts of our Lord's life and teaching remain untouched; and so far from the miraculous features of it being of later growth, they are prominent in the earliest and most elementary form of the tradition. Whatever else they told, or did not tell, of His words or actions, the Incarnation, the Passion, and the Resurrection were the vital portions of the apostles' teaching. Christianity, if it is the Truth, has nothing to fear from free criticism; and if all Christians would meet criticism, whether hostile or friendly, in this faith and in this spirit, they would find that it is robbed at once of all the 'unsettling' and 'dangerous' tendencies that are often attributed to it.

The English Poor: a Sketch of their Social and Economic History.

By T. MACKAY. (London: John Murray, 1889.)

THE interest which is now generally felt in economic and social questions gives such a book as this a good right to existence. Its object is to show the historical origin of the present economic situation, and to deduce therefrom the principles upon which attempts to reform it should be conducted. The Socialist argument is that the evil lot of the lower orders in society is due to the principle of Individualism, of which the incarnation is to be found in the feudal system, which still is the main characteristic of our social order. Mr. Mackay's contention, on the other hand, is that while the feudal system is indeed the main cause of our social evils, the feudal system is itself the outcome of the socialistic principle. He takes his start from the Village Community, which is generally admitted to have been the earliest stage of the stationary agricultural state of society (pp. 26, 27). This involved a completely socialistic tenure of land, and its results ought therefore, on the Socialist theory, to have been entirely satisfactory. Instead of this, the universal result, owing to the inherent tendency in human nature towards private property, was that the land of the community became vested in the head-man, while the other members of it became serfs—*adscripti glebæ*. In this way the Village Community developed into the Manor (p. 31), and labour became divorced from property. In this fact lay the germ of all our troubles. Mr. Mackay proceeds to sketch the outline of the economic history of England. He first dwells on the condition of the labourer in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, during which the servile population was gradually working its way to emancipation and a copyhold tenure of land

(p. 54). Then came the Black Death, with its frightful diminution of the population. Labour became scarce, and it was more profitable to work for hire than to own a small copyhold; and this it was which caused the final divorce of the labourer from the land. He ceased to be either a copyholder or a serf attached to the soil; he became merely an independent labourer, selling his labour for what price it would fetch (pp. 57, 58). As this class, bereft of all the prudent instincts which property creates, increased and multiplied, its status declined, and by the time of the early Tudor kings we find the existence of a proletariat population established. Statutes on vagrancy became common, and in 1601 the Act of 43 Elizabeth ordained a compulsory poor-rate, which is the origin of the poor-law legislation of modern times.

It is impossible to do more than indicate very briefly the historical drift of the first part of Mr. Mackay's book, and we have passed over some portions of it altogether, such as the story of the Trade Guilds, with the suggestive parallel which they form to the modern Trades Unions. The history is at times sketchy, but the facts of it are indisputable, and are stated in a dispassionate, uncontroversial manner. The second part of the work (from chapter viii. onwards) deals with the modern aspect of the question, from the industrial revolution which took place in the eighteenth century down to the present day. In these chapters the individualistic views of the author come more prominently into play. He insists strongly (but not too strongly in our opinion) on the salutary effect of private property alike on the labour and the character of the man. The crying evil of the present day is over-population, and over-population is largely caused by irresponsibility, which begets imprudence and recklessness. He therefore advocates the releasing of land from all the fetters which hamper its transfer, and the encouragement of individual exertion and individual responsibility in every possible way. Into the merits of the controversy between Socialism and Individualism it is impossible to enter here. The Socialist will use the same facts of history to support his totally different conclusions, as Mr. Mackay himself admits (p. 289). But Mr. Mackay has unquestionably treated the subject with great ability from his own point of view, and with a most praiseworthy abstention from controversial polemic. This volume will possibly not convert many Socialists, particularly those in whom emotion is more powerful than reason; but it will supply Individualists with many arguments, historical and economical, in support of their beliefs, and it may serve to remind readers of both schools of thought of the necessity of studying economical problems with a due respect for reason and history as well as for emotion and sentiment.

The Squatter's Dream: a Story of Australian Life. By ROLF BOLDREWOOD. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

READERS of the able and interesting novel, *Robbery under Arms*, will be anxious to make the acquaintance of another story by the same writer. Mr. Rolf Boldrewood has set himself a high standard by

the success of his earlier work, which combined interest in the incidents of the story with interest in its leading characters. It cannot fairly be said that *The Squatter's Dream* is the equal of its predecessor in either of these respects. The hero of it, Jack Redgrave, is a squatter who, discontented with the process of getting gradually wealthy on a comparatively small cattle-farm, ventures everything on a large sheep-run, with all its potentialities for becoming rich beyond the dreams of avarice. The greater part of the book is taken up with the vicissitudes of this speculation, and the ultimate catastrophe caused by a prolonged drought. An exploring expedition into the unknown country follows, which is perhaps the best portion of the story; and after one more plunge into misfortune the hero emerges triumphant into success and matrimony. The descriptions of Australian life are well done, and convey a good idea of it to all who are interested in the conditions under which our brothers in the colonies are working out the development of a country which must hold a leading place in the Greater Britain of the future. The weakness of the book lies in the fact that the author fails to interest us in his characters. In *Robbery under Arms* the principal characters were clearly imagined, and the reader was interested alike in them and in several of the minor personages of the story; but in the present work the fortunes of the hero do not move us greatly, and the heroine is a mere sketch. No doubt the plan of the work did not admit of such stirring incidents as those of the earlier romance. The failure of a sheep-farm is less effective for the purposes of narrative than the 'sticking-up' of a gold escort or an escape from Berrima gaol. But it is in the characters that the inferiority of the present work is most marked, which have neither the reality nor the pathos of those of its predecessor. We hope it is only a temporary decline. Stories of Indian or colonial life are sure of a warm welcome in England if their merits at all justify it, and Mr. Rolf Boldrewood has shown promise of good work of this kind, which we should be sorry to see unfulfilled.

Wordsworthiana: a Selection from Papers read to the Wordsworth Society. Edited by WILLIAM KNIGHT. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889.)

THIS volume contains the essence, as presented to the outside public, of the work of the Wordsworth Society. The full record of its achievements is contained in the eight volumes of its *Transactions*, and the present collection makes no pretence to reproduce the more mechanical, though not the least useful, part of the Society's work, such as the bibliography of the poet's writings and the publication of some of his hitherto unprinted letters. It may be presumed, however, to contain the best things that the poet's admirers found to say about him, and it therefore affords no unfair test of the advantages of such a society. Literary societies have increased and multiplied greatly within the present generation, and the example of the Browning Society shows that a man is not safe from being the subject of one even while he is alive. The Wordsworth Society, however,

was not composed of fanatics, and it may at least be claimed for it that it did not tend to make the subject of its worship ridiculous. The papers contained in the present volume are written by men of recognized standing in the world of letters—men who would not be led by their affection for any poet to make claims for him which a sober literary judgment must hold absurd. Among them are Matthew Arnold, Canon Ainger, Mr. Lowell, Lord Houghton, Lord Selborne, Mr. Aubrey de Vere, Mr. R. H. Hutton, Mr. Stopford Brooke, Mr. Rawnsley, and Professor Veitch. At the same time the character of the papers shows something of the besetting danger of such societies. A man writing about his favourite author for the general public will attempt to put down a complete outline of his estimate of that author; but when he is writing for a meeting of other men, who are equally devotees at the same shrine, he will think it impertinent to indicate the general grounds of his admiration, and endeavour to pick out some unobvious point of detail upon which to comment, or to look at his subject in some new and more or less unexpected light. Instances may be given of this tendency from the present volume in Mr. Shorthouse's paper on 'The Platonism of Wordsworth,' or Mr. Spence Watson's on 'Wordsworth's Relations to Science.' There are, however, several papers which deal with points more closely and legitimately connected with the poet, and which will be found interesting by all lovers of Wordsworth, to whom alone they are addressed. The most comprehensive in subject is Professor Veitch's on 'The Theism of Wordsworth,' which, if a trifle solid, is a valuable essay on a subject of much importance in connexion with the poet. Canon Ainger's two papers, on 'Wordsworth and Charles Lamb' and 'Poets who helped to form Wordsworth's Style,' deal with points of minor but legitimate interest; and any writing of Canon Ainger on literary subjects is worth reading. Mr. Rawnsley contributes an amusing paper on 'Reminiscences of Wordsworth amongst the Peasantry of Westmoreland,' collected by himself from the lips of those who had seen the poet, and who with much unanimity preferred the lively sociability of Hartley Coleridge to the grave and abstracted manners of Wordsworth. Mr. Stopford Brooke does good service in recalling attention to Wordsworth's 'Guide to the Lakes'; and Mr. Aubrey de Vere is interesting on 'The Personal Character of Wordsworth's Poetry.' Of the presidential addresses, Lord Selborne's strikes us as distinctly the best, and as containing a clear, sober, and appreciative statement of the Wordsworthian creed, delivered as the earnest conviction of the writer. The days of fanaticism, whether for or against Wordsworth, are gone; but this volume will, as a whole, be found well worth reading by all those many lovers of his work who look on him as one of the very foremost of our English poets—to be placed after Shakespeare, no doubt, and after Milton, but perhaps after no other in the whole range of English song.

The Life of Valentin Alberti, D.D., Professor of Divinity . . . and six times Rector of the University of Leipzig (b. 1635, d. 1697). Briefly sketched by ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. (London : David Nutt, 1889.)

CANON JENKINS has no doubt found it interesting to compile an account of the life of a person of some importance in his day, from whom he himself claims descent ; but it may be doubted whether the general public will feel much interest in the work. Alberti lived in a somewhat barren period as regards theological thought, and he does not appear to have risen in any way above his time. He was an active and vigorous controversialist, and was engaged in contests with Puffendorf, Bossuet, Bellarmine, and other theologians and philosophers of note ; but the controversies are not of a kind in which much interest is felt at the present day, and Canon Jenkins wisely avoids expatiating on them. The most attractive part of the biography is that which deals with Alberti's connexion with the Philobiblical College of Leipzig, which tried to revive the direct study of the Scriptures, but which fell under the condemnation of 'Pietism,' and was finally prohibited. Alberti, however, though president of the College, was not its founder nor its leading spirit ; and the story of the Society and its suppression is neither fully nor clearly told by Canon Jenkins. In short, the general impression left by this rather sketchy volume is that one knows very little about its subject by the time one has finished it, and that what little one has learnt is neither very important nor very interesting.

Paul Nugent : Materialist. By HELEN F. HETHERINGTON (GULLIFER) and the Rev. H. DARWIN BURTON. 2 vols. (London : Griffith, Farren, Okeden, and Welsh. No date.)

It was a bold task with which the authors of *Paul Nugent* grappled when they determined to write a Rejoinder to *Robert Elsmere*. Not because Mrs. Humphry Ward's much vaunted book is unanswerable ; but because the complete and systematic refutation of so elaborate an essay was liable to be protracted to a wearisome prolixity, and because the story into which the reply was interwoven would inevitably challenge comparison with the artistic skill and finish of the book which had prompted it. We may, however, at once congratulate the joint authors of *Paul Nugent* on their success in coping with the preliminary difficulties. They have not been betrayed into too minute a discussion of 'the fallacies' (to borrow Mr. Gladstone's expression) 'of the hybrid and unreal system set up by Robert Elsmere,' and they have produced a story which, if inferior to it in the conception and delineation of individual character—for none of the actors in *Paul Nugent* present the vivid dramatic force or are as instinct with life as Catherine Elsmere or her gifted and bewitching sister—yet for honest dealing with the great questions which each of the stories involves, we think *Paul Nugent* very largely the superior. Throughout its pages, although the purpose of its authors is to establish a foregone conclusion, they uniformly endeavour to do this by fair discussion of the points at issue without the subtle under-

current of depreciation with which Mrs. Ward undermines the intellectual position of her orthodox believers.

For Paul Nugent, the Materialist, is assuredly not placed in any damaging perspective in the work before us. The motherless son of an avowed atheist, and trained in infidelity from childhood; the unhappy victim of an ill-assorted marriage, in which the misery inseparable from such a connexion is aggravated by the secret intemperance and the professed Christianity of the heartless flirt who calls him husband; the butt of an injudicious Evangelical vicar who selects the moment of his wife's funeral to pelt him with coarse reproaches and with threats that he 'will be rejected with the vilest of the human race and see hell-fire;' without any tender memories of early childhood, without the hallowing influence of a pious mother, with all the surroundings that tend to foster pride of intellect, with the proverbial hindrances which prosperity brings to the culture of man's deeper nature, Paul Nugent has much to plead in mitigation of his agnosticism. Handsome in person, generous and high-principled, if somewhat over-sensitive to the opinion of neighbours, who abhor his infidelity, he is drawn in most attractive colours. The mode, too, in which he is gradually won to faith through the combined influence of several adequate causes is depicted under circumstances which are not unworthy of the serious issues involved. There is no subtle analysis of character, but little play of conflicting passions, no special dexterity of delineation or inventive genius; but the characters are simple and real enough. There is considerable skill in the method with which the religious questions debated are made to arise out of the natural movement of the narrative; and scenes of suffering—whether furnished by the death-bed of a returned prodigal of Paul Nugent's own class in life or of a drunken wretch in some crowded alley—suggest and point the inadequacy of agnosticism to meet the deep, but common, wants of humanity at large.

Nor should we be doing justice to this Rejoinder if we omitted to say that, although condensed within a much briefer space than *Robert Elsmere*, the pages of *Paul Nugent* do supply an answer to almost every point which Mrs. Humphry Ward has raised, and that in many instances the answer is tersely and powerfully put. We should select the arguments based upon the unity of consciousness, upon the evidence given by the Church to the authority of the Canon, and upon the old and still irrefutable dilemma 'Aut Deus aut non bonus' as perhaps the most satisfactory sections of the distinctly controversial portion of the book. One passage is specially adapted for that singular and yet common form of modern weak-kneed scepticism, which combines the profession of admiration for our Lord with the rejection of His claims. In speaking of the singular lack of defence attempted by Elsmere, the authors observe—

'When everything that he held most dear is slipping from him in the agonies of a dying faith, he goes to those who first began the undermining process. Under these circumstances the result is inevitable, and Elsmere naturally ceases to be a Christian.

'And yet he calls his new religion "The Christian Brotherhood."

Yes, and to complete the paradox, still carries his New Testament in his pocket. . . . Could anything be more monstrous? "I wondered at that myself," said Paul, thoughtfully. I could not follow the authoress's train of reasoning. If Elsmere degrades his Christ from the Godhead to a manhood not superior to his own, how could he find anything but a sting and a reproach in the book which exalts Him to the highest heaven? In his place I should have locked it up, and never looked at it again' (i. 242-3).

We have been anxious to do full justice at once to the purpose and the performance of *Paul Nugent*, but we cannot refrain from adding our regret that such a book should be necessary at all, and that its execution should be marred by some palpable blots. Surely in a work intended to maintain Church truth, all allusion to party feeling should have been carefully avoided, and a slap at Evangelicism is strangely out of place. It is a further defect that amidst the problems which have exercised the minds of thoughtful men, Lovell, the exponent and champion of Church teaching, moves somewhat too airily, and is, to use Paul Nugent's own term, rather too 'cocksure' of everything that makes for his own side of the question. Yet, after all, these are minor blemishes. Our own deepest objection lies against the very conception of a work of Christian apologetic in which all the solemn questions of belief in God and the soul, in Christianity and in the Church of Christ, are brought into a story of some 500 brief pages and sandwiched between the chapters of a novel. It may be a necessity of our times, but it is a necessity which we very deeply deplore.

Sermons to Boys, preached in Winchester College Chapel. By the Rev. J. T. BRAMSTON, M.A. (London: Swan, Sonnenschein, and Co., 1890.)

THIS volume will be found interesting and suggestive, if not particularly striking, by anyone, while it will be of especial interest to Wykehamists, to whom Mr. Bramston is a familiar figure. It is always a little difficult to judge of the value of a schoolmaster's sermon from merely reading it. With a congregation of boys, more than with any other, the personal character and influence of the preacher has a decisive influence on the effect of the sermon. A sermon may be true, careful, and able, but unless the master carries weight with the boys by his personal influence, it will not be attended to by the bulk of the congregation. In the pulpit as in the classroom the master needs that magnetic power of character which is the possession, more or less, of all good teachers, and which explains the wide difference which there is between ability to learn and ability to teach. Therefore we cannot say whether Mr. Bramston's sermons were effective as originally preached; but they are unquestionably thoughtful, simple, and direct, and they touch on many of the points which most require noticing in schoolboy life. Two which have struck us as among the most noticeable are those on 'The Teachings of our Past' and 'Loyalty,' and as they are also the two latest in date of the sermons in this volume, there is ground for hoping that Mr. Bramston is yet far from having finished his work as a schoolmaster and a preacher.

Time and Tide : a Romance of the Moon ; being Two Lectures delivered at the London Institution, November 1888. By Sir ROBERT S. BALL, LL.D., F.R.S., Royal Astronomer of Ireland. 'Romance of Science' Series. (London : S.P.C.K., 1889.)

THIS little volume is a representation in a popular form of the theory of Tidal Evolution, and comprises a description of the action of the tides, the theory of their causation, the history of their origin and work in the very far distant past, and the prophecy (which conforms to the popular rule, never to prophesy unless you know) of their work in the far distant future. Though described as a popular work it contains the outline (omitting mathematical demonstrations) of several sufficiently intricate theories, and is not always quite easy reading, though it is always interesting to those who care to know about the action of the great forces of the universe. It will probably surprise most unscientific readers of this book to find that the action of the tides is about the most important factor in the fate of the little system which comprises the earth and the moon ; that the tides are diminishing the speed of the earth's rotation, and are consequently increasing (infinitesimally, it is true, but steadily) the length of the day, and are also increasing the distance of the earth from the moon. It is to the action of the tides which the earth formerly raised on the moon's surface that our satellite owes its having reached that stable condition in which the period of rotation on its own axis is equal to the period of its revolution round the earth, so that it always presents the same face to us ; and it will be to the action of the tide which the moon raises on the earth's surface that we shall eventually owe our reaching the same condition of stability, with a day and a month alike of fourteen hundred hours, and, but for the further disturbing influence of the tides raised by the sun, should thenceforth always present the same face to the moon. For the explanation and proof of these somewhat startling facts reference must be made to the book itself, which contains several other peeps into the marvels of science, of which the moral that seems perpetually to force itself upon the reader is that 'though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small.' Among others we cannot refrain from noticing Sir R. Ball's incidental mention of the stupendous explosion of Krakatoa in 1883, of which the sound was heard at a distance of three thousand miles, and at Celebes, 970 miles away, steamers put out to see what had happened ; while the undulations of air caused by it were traced circling seven times around our globe, and the cloud of dust and ashes raised by it was followed rather more than twice round the globe before it rose higher and produced those magnificent sunsets which we remember in the December of that year, more than three months after the date of the explosion.

John Vale's Guardian. By D. CHRISTIE MURRAY. Three Vols. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

It is always a pleasure to read one of Mr. Christie Murray's novels, particularly when he is dealing with English rustic life ; and his last work is no exception to this rule. The story is of a lad left, when

still weak in the brain from an accident, as a ward to his uncle, Robert Snelling, a strong-willed, ambitious, and selfish farmer. The plot centres on the dark schemes of Snelling to secure the absolute possession of the valuable lands which he holds in trust for his ward, for the details and result of which the reader is referred to the book itself. And, in truth, the main interest is not in the plot, but in the characters. Artistically, indeed, the story is not beyond reproach, and does not equal Mr. Murray's best work. We lose all except a fitful interest in the boy, John Vale, before we are half-way through the second volume; and his *fidus Achates*, Will Gregg, who at first promises to be attractive, disappears altogether at about the same stage. The final catastrophe, too, is rather hurried and rather melodramatic. But the characters are drawn with a skill which recalls most pleasantly the author of *Aunt Rachel*. Snelling himself, and two or three other specimens of the Midland farmer, Isaiah Winter, the long-headed but kind-hearted factotum of Snelling and the successful speculator in coal, Tobias Orme the drunkard (a most amusing and lifelike sketch), the French artist Jousserau, with several minor personages, form a very interesting group of characters, and make the novel, as a whole, a thoroughly readable and attractive work.

A Reputed Changeling: or, Three Seventh Years Two Centuries Ago.

By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Two Vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889.)

It can hardly be necessary in these days to review at great length a new story by Miss Yonge. All who are likely to read it know by this time what they have to expect. Whether the scene of action be historical or contemporary, Miss Yonge's novels are essentially the novels of domestic life and the domestic virtues. It is an instrument of limited scope upon which she plays; but the same may be said of almost any novelist except the greatest, and most emphatically of the school which is the direct opposite of Miss Yonge's, that of the writers of the novel of the domestic vices, which proclaims itself with so much blatancy as containing the only full and true representation of human life. It is for everyone to choose the kind of literature which suits his taste, and it is no bad sign that a very large number of persons find their taste suited best by such novels as Miss Yonge's.

The present work is a very fair representative of her style. It cannot be called strong, either in characterization or in narrative, but it is passable in both respects. The scene is laid in the times shortly before and after the Revolution of 1688, and the localities in which the action takes place are chiefly Winchester, Portchester, and the court of King James, both at Whitehall and St. Germain. The central idea, from which the book takes its title, is of a child who is universally believed, in accordance with a common superstition of those days, to have been 'changed at birth,' a belief which the child himself is forced to share from having it constantly impressed on him by others. The critical periods in the life of such a changeling were always held to be at the end of each space of seven years, at which time it was possible for the stolen infant to be restored from the land

of the fairies ; and it is at such intervals of seven years that the crises of Peregrine Oakshott's life occur. The other principal character in the story is Anne Woodford, who, with her mother, is the first to bring the good influence of kindness to bear on the persecuted 'changeling.' The course of the story, with the experiences of Anne Woodford as attendant in the royal nursery at the time of the Revolution, and the final pathetic redemption of the unfortunate 'changeling,' must be read in the novel itself, which though not equal to the best of Miss Yonge's works, is not below the average to which she generally attains.

The Quest of Sir Bertrand, and other Poems. By R. H. DOMENICHETTI. (London : W. H. Allen & Co., 1890.)

Mr. DOMENICHETTI's verse belongs to the school of pictorial poetry. His literary affinities are with Keats, Rossetti, and William Morris. His subjects are mediæval and Christian, with a general tincture of romance. These being the component elements of his poetry, it will be easy to imagine the character of this volume. Its merit lies in an artistic sense of colour and pictorial effect, and of the beauty to be found in the careful use of language. Its main failing is a weakness in thought and originality, together with the lack of that command of metre and rhythm which is required to give its full effect to pictorial poetry. The principal piece in the volume, from which it takes its name, is a long poem in four-line stanzas, containing not a few graceful word-paintings ; but the story is thin and the general idea somewhat hackneyed. The shorter poems are more interesting ; many of them are a pleasure to read, and must have been still more a pleasure to write. The most striking is the short blank verse poem entitled *Danse des Bacchantes*, a brilliant picture of an overflowing rush of life and beauty, dying away into a peaceful and harmonious close. It is not, however, quite a characteristic specimen of the general tone of the volume, which is divided between what may be called romantic Christianity and romantic melancholy. If this is Mr. Domenichetti's first effort in verse, it is far from unpromising. We do not think he has strength or originality enough ever to be a great poet ; at any rate there are no signs of these qualities as yet ; but he has a graceful, artistic sense of beauty, and if he will study more fully the delicacies of metrical effect, he may produce more permanent work than that which he has given us in this volume.

Letters of Horace Walpole. Selected and edited by C. D. YONGE, M.A. 2 vols. (London : Fisher Unwin, 1890.)

No collection of letters by Horace Walpole could fail to provide interesting reading, and a new edition which recalls them to our notice is therefore so far to be welcomed. The eighteenth century is rich in books of memoirs, letters, light essays, and gossip, which make us intimately acquainted with the social and literary life of the period, as well as with the inner history of its politics. Among the writers of this class Horace Walpole holds

undoubtedly the highest place. He is nearly as full of detail as Boswell, and he gives a much wider sphere, touching alike on literature, politics, and society. Volumes of letters are apt to be somewhat wearisome to read continuously, even when they are written by acknowledged masters of the art, like Gray or Cowper; but Horace Walpole shares with Charles Lamb the merit of never tiring the reader, and of being very difficult to put down—and this without possessing at all the same *personal* or literary charm as pervades everything that the latter ever wrote.

But all these characteristics make it necessary that the letters, if edited at all, should be edited very carefully. They require an intimate knowledge of the history and literature of the period and of the gossip and scandal recorded both by Walpole himself and by other writers. An ideal selection edited with judicious notes would make a very attractive volume; but we do not think Mr. Yonge approaches this ideal. To begin with, we doubt if there is a demand for a selection in two volumes of considerable size. There are intelligible justifications either for a library edition of the whole correspondence or for a volume of a size and price suitable to the collections of readers with more limited means and accommodation; but this edition seems to fall between the two, though there is no complaint to be made of the way in which the volumes are got up in themselves. Further, the editing is not well done. Allusions which require explanation are passed over, while we are informed that the battle of Edgehill was the first engagement in the Civil War, and that Pitt and Fox were great orators. The editor's opinions are thrust on us at some length, and we are given disquisitions on the character of Rienzi and the merits of Addison's humour, to say nothing of the remarkable historical judgments conveyed in the notes on Necker and Lafayette. The authorities most frequently referred to are the editor's own compilations on other subjects. Moreover, the proofs must have been carelessly corrected, or else the editor must be credited with some curious beliefs as to the spelling of the names of several well-known persons and places. What, for instance, is to be made of Lady Mary Montague, George Coleman, Pharsalea, Chandemagore, Clarissa Harbour? The latter occurs in a note on Samuel Richardson which, if necessary at all, might be expected to be appended to the first occurrence of his name in the letters, instead of the last. And who is responsible for the remarkable Latin word *sudentem* on p. 29 of vol. i.? Finally, what is to be thought of the discernment of an editor who, finding the following passage in reference to some poems in one of the letters, 'there is . . . a delicacy in the thoughts that no Scotchman is capable of, though a *Scotchwoman* might inspire it'—where the allusion is to the attachment of Conway, the author of the poems, to Lady Aylesbury, a *Scotchwoman*—paraphrases it into 'no Scotchman is capable of such delicacy of thought, though a *Scotchwoman* may be!' In short, the editing of Horace Walpole's letters requires more trouble, knowledge, and thought than Mr. Yonge appears to have been able to devote to the purpose. At the same time it must be said that, though the notes

give comparatively little assistance towards the comprehension of the text, they do not materially detract from the enjoyment to be derived from the leisurely perusal of the gossip of Horace Walpole.

Opposites : a Series of Essays on the Unpopular Sides of Popular Questions. By LEWIS THORNTON. (Edinburgh and London : Blackwood and Sons, 1890.)

MR. LEWIS THORNTON appears to think that he has a monopoly of the instinct of contradiction, and that in writing to support what he considers to be the unpopular sides of certain questions, chiefly of a religious and semi-religious nature, he is doing a thing almost unprecedented in literature. We, on the other hand, should have thought that the spirit of opposition was everywhere abroad in the land, and that the Mephistopheles who guides or mis-guides modern intellectual processes was emphatically 'the spirit who ever contradicts.' Writers of magazine articles find it so hard to catch the ear of the public by the statement of unexaggerated truth that they most commonly take refuge either in exaggeration or in paradox ; and there probably never was an age in which people less required to be reminded that there are two sides to most questions. Mr. Lewis Thornton, however, believes himself, in common with Socrates and Artemus Ward, to possess the peculiar gift of a sceptical and contradictory mind, and he has accordingly set himself to pick holes in the common-place views of the day in respect of modern progress, religious thought, evolution, and 'Orthodox Christianity.'

After an announcement to this effect in the preface, the reader is led to expect a series of startling and revolutionary paradoxes in the body of the work ; and he is therefore surprised to find that the author, for the most part, roars as gently as any sucking dove. It is not his paradoxes which will annoy the reader so much as his apparently inadequate acquaintance with the opinions about which he writes. It is no new view that evolution must be balanced by devolution ; on the contrary, it is expressly stated in Mr. Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* and other text books on the subject. Nor is pessimism so unfashionable as to require a special re-statement at the present day ; though Mr. Lewis Thornton gives us no help towards answering the standing puzzle of pessimism, 'If life is so bad, why live?' Mr. Lewis Thornton also appears to take delight in recalling attention to the creeds of spiritualism and theosophy, but it is not clear what right his papers on these subjects have in this volume, as he is not in favour of these creeds, and he surely cannot think himself singular in opposing them. He seems, however, to take pleasure in throwing Scriptural texts at their disciples (as to the applicability of which there may often be some doubt), and generally to attach a quite unnecessary importance to their proceedings.

But it is in connexion with modern religious views that this perverseness is most evident. Mr. Lewis Thornton has erected a bugbear which he calls 'Orthodox Christianity,' at which he proceeds to throw stones whenever an opportunity offers. He claims to

be an earnest student of the Bible himself, but accuses modern Christians of reading it only in a partial and one-sided fashion. There may be some truth in this accusation in many cases, but the attitude of a religion must be judged from the position of its acknowledged and respected leaders, and Mr. Lewis Thornton would perhaps be surprised to find that most of the views which he appears especially to pride himself upon holding, are commonly accepted by the leaders of the English Church. It is not in the least 'distressing to Orthodox Christianity' (p. 136), to be told that Buddha, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, and many other non-Christians, ancient and modern, lived most noble and virtuous lives, and that for this they will hereafter have their reward. Surely it is not at the present day that theology can be accused of devoting 'atheists' to 'certain damnation' (p. 127). In short, the whole of Mr. Lewis Thornton's references to 'Orthodox Christianity' in his article on 'Atheistic Christianity' are grossly unfair, while the view which he seems to think himself peculiar in taking is precisely that which is held by the leaders of Christian thought to-day. Similarly, what can Mr. Lewis Thornton know of the subject on which he is writing, when he states that the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the final triumph of right at the Second Coming 'are, perhaps, exactly the points which are most slurred over by the theology of to-day'? His lines must have fallen in curious places if that represents his genuine experience of modern Christian teaching.

It is impossible not to be somewhat annoyed with this book, not because it attacks popular views, but because it misrepresents and then attacks views with which the author appears to be in substantial agreement. Mr. Lewis Thornton would probably not care to be told that he seems to hold very ordinary views on most subjects, and that if he did not feel himself bound, by the plan of his book, to be occasionally carping at the representatives of various classes of thought, he might have written an interesting and suggestive work on the questions in which he is interested. But so it is; and in conclusion a protest may be entered against the general scheme of the book. Criticism has no right to devote itself consciously to advocating one side of a great question just because that side is in a minority. Its business is to aim at the whole truth according to the writer's best abilities, not to give what he knows to be only a partial statement, and therefore probably a partial mis-statement, of the truth. If *Opposites* had come up to the programme announced for it, it would have been a mischievous, because intentionally imperfect, book. As it is, it will probably be harmless, and it only suggests that the writer is capable of better things.

1. *Village Sermons and Town and Country Sermons.* 2. *The Water of Life, and other Sermons.* 3. *Sermons for the Times.* 4. *Sermons on National Subjects.* By CHARLES KINGSLEY. New and Cheaper Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

THE reappearance of these sermons in a cheaper and excellent edition comes at a happy time. The name of Charles Kingsley has lately

been recalled to the public attention in connexion with his controversy with Cardinal Newman ; and the way in which this allusion has been made in some quarters might suggest to those who do not know him that he was an unfair or a blundering controversialist. Such an idea would be at once corrected by reading these sermons or any other of Kingsley's writings. It may be admitted that Kingsley's want of acquaintance with Newman's character led him wrongly to connect his name with practices which, however they may at times have been chargeable against the Roman Church, were utterly alien to Newman's mind and principles. But it is best to let the memory of a controversy die of which the most notable fact is that we owe to it the *Apologetica*, and get what good we can from the work alike of Newman and of Kingsley. There are few religious works more bracing and strengthening to the moral fibre than the writings of Charles Kingsley, whether they be his sermons or his novels or his letters. They always convey the idea of a strong and very attractive personality behind them. They exhibit the figure of a manly, straightforward, vigorous Christian, who was not afraid to think clearly and to speak clearly before all men. Particularly they should be recommended to all those who, having perhaps been brought up to a very narrow view of Christian doctrine, find their reason or their sentiments revolt against its teachings. Kingsley had been himself through the great struggle with doubts and difficulties, and he knew how to help those who were in like troubles. The *Village and Town and Country Sermons*, in particular, is a volume which would do good to anyone, and which no country clergyman should be without. His whole life shows how a man of the greatest abilities may devote himself to a country parish and through that parish speak also to the world. It is to be hoped that the appearance of this edition points to a continuous demand for Kingsley's writings ; for manliness and honesty, combined with earnest faith and strenuous work, are virtues which cannot be too much encouraged and stimulated.

One word as to the external appearance of these volumes. In a uniform edition one would expect the paper and type of the various volumes to be the same, whereas in these there are considerable differences in both respects. The type is, however, clear and good in all, and the paper in three of them ; but the paper of the *National Sermons* is distinctly inferior to that of the other volumes. This is not a common fault in Messrs. Macmillan's publications, and it is a pity that it should have occurred in this case. In every other respect this edition is to be warmly welcomed.

The Monumental History of the Early British Church. By J. ROMILLY ALLEN, F.S.A. (Scot.), author of *Rhind Lectures on Early Christian Symbolism in Great Britain and Ireland*. (London : S.P.C.K., 1889.)

THE purpose of this volume is to collect and briefly describe the archæological remains of Christianity in Great Britain and Ireland before the Norman Conquest. Mr. Allen rightly points out that the information on this subject is for the most part scattered about in

separate treatises and the Reports of various learned societies, and that there is no general introduction to it available for the ordinary reader. The architectural history of the English Church since the Conquest is admirably described in such a handbook as Mr. J. H. Parker's *Introduction to Gothic Architecture*; but Mr. Parker was unduly sceptical as to the existence of genuine Saxon buildings, and his volume makes no pretence to cover the archæological data of other descriptions than architecture. Mr. Allen divides his subject chronologically into the periods of the Romano-British Church (including the time of Augustine), the early and later Celtic Church (the division being made at A.D. 600), and the Saxon Church from A.D. 600 to 1066; and in each period the materials are arranged under the headings of structures, sepulchral and other monuments, and portable objects. The most elaborate portion of the work is that which deals with the Irish Church, and this prominence is no doubt deserved by the enormously important position of that Church in those days. At the same time the Saxon Church appears to get a trifle less than its due proportionate notice. For instance, while the Celtic illuminated MSS. are dealt with at some length, those of the Saxon Church are passed over in silence. A few inaccuracies appear here and there. Mr. J. H. Parker is twice spoken of as *Sir* J. H. Parker, and it is not the genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel that begins with the words 'Christi autem generatio sic erat' (p. 161), but the narrative immediately following it. These, however, are not important, and are only noticed because the book may very probably reach another edition; in which case it will be greatly improved by the addition of more illustrations, since archæological details cannot be clearly appreciated except by the eye. It is a handy little volume, full of interesting information, and it has one feature which is characteristic of all good introductions to any subject: namely, that it indicates to the reader where further details may be found on each point of discussion. It would require the knowledge of two or three specialists to say how far the lists of extant monuments of the British Church are exhaustive; but they appear to be drawn up with great care, and the whole volume should be welcome to those who feel an interest in the Christian archæology of England.

Gray and his Friends. Letters and Relics, in great part hitherto unpublished. Edited by DUNCAN C. TOVEY, M.A. (Cambridge: University Press, 1890.)

GRAY is one of those fortunate men of letters who, like Sir Philip Sidney, or Cowper, or Charles Lamb, have an attraction in their personal characteristics quite distinct from that which belongs to their writings. We feel an affection for them as if they were our own friends, and to collect little unimportant details connected with them is a pleasant office, of an entirely different character from the relentless prying into the lives of men of note which is so common at the present day. Like Cowper and like Lamb, Gray wrote letters which are attractive and readable still—not so simple and unaffected as Cowper's, not so humorous or so full of literary wisdom as Lamb's,

VOL. XXXI.—NO. LXI.

S

but the letters of a man of singularly cultured tastes corresponding with friends of similar disposition on terms of frank affection promoted by community of interests. Moreover, the stray writings of so fastidious a composer as Gray have a special interest, and the travelling diaries of the man who discovered the English Lakes may be counted on to show signs of genuine appreciation of what is noticeable in foreign scenery. This is the justification of such a volume as the present. It has no claim to produce matters of very permanent value, but it is the gleanings of an affectionate admirer of the poet, and adds a little to our knowledge of him and his friends. It includes letters of Gray himself, and of his friends Walpole, West, and Ashton; notes of foreign travel; odds and ends of verse, English and Latin, from Gray's note-books; and other miscellaneous fragments of similar kinds. Such a volume could not but be fragmentary and disjointed; nor does it make any pretence to be otherwise. The most interesting section is that which is devoted to the letters of West. West is the most lovable of Gray's friends, and the pathos alike of his life and his death lends additional interest to letters which are in themselves attractive from their enthusiasm for literary subjects. The journals of travel, with the exception of the journey to Naples in 1740, are mostly skeleton notes which might afterwards be worked up into something more elaborate. The friends of Gray at the present time will be grateful to Mr. Tovey for his labours in collecting these *disiecta membra poetæ*; but it appears to have been a labour of love, and as such it is its own reward.

My Rectors. By a quondam Curate. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1890.)

This book is apparently intended to combine amusement with profit. We cannot say that we have derived from it much of either. The chief impression which it conveys is that the writer failed to find anywhere a rector with whom he could work, and the natural comment is that the fault may not have been wholly with the rectors. The descriptions of the various clerical personages mentioned may be taken, as the author says, from life; but if so he has very little power of characterization, and they have little appearance of life about them. Everyone knows that rectors are not perfect, any more than other men, but the three here described fail to suggest any common type of the present day; and where we find that one of the grievances against two of them was that they did not allow their curate to preach at the principal services, we are inclined, from the point of view of the congregation, to take part with the rectors. The suggestions for the improvement of the organization of the Church of England are no doubt well-intentioned and may be worth considering; but we cannot think that this is a happy way of giving them utterance.

Demas: or the Windings of a Pastor's Life. By CLARION WEST. (Manchester: Brook and Chrystal, 1890.)

THE object of this story (written presumably by a Nonconformist) is to show the evils of the Congregationalist system, by which the

minister is dependent for his livelihood upon pleasing his congregation. There is no doubt much truth in the author's view of the hardships and humiliations of a minister's life under these circumstances, and of the cliques and counter-influences which he has to contend against; and the reminder may be useful to those who would introduce a similar system of 'popular control' into the Church of England. But of the literary qualities of the story the less said the better. The style is very peculiar, and a sort of running commentary in parentheses would be extremely irritating if it were not unintentionally comic. The verses and the illustrations are almost less successful than the prose.

The Country Clergyman and his Work. Six Lectures on Pastoral Theology, delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, May Term, 1889. By the Rev. HERBERT JAMES, M.A., Rector of Livermere, Suffolk. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.)

THIS is a volume which should prove suggestive to any clergyman working in a country parish. It is probable that the lectures were even more effective as originally delivered than they are in the form of a book; for the method of personal address which makes a lecture bright and pointed becomes a disadvantage when it is read instead of being heard. However, in a work of this kind, it is the matter which is of prime importance; and here Mr. James seems to have covered his field effectively and well. He begins by vindicating the position of a country clergyman from the slur which is sometimes tacitly cast upon it, of implying laziness and want of energy. His arguments will speak for themselves, and a little reflection will convince anyone of the truth of his claim, even without argument. He might have added that many men are far better fitted, either mentally or physically, for country than for town work, and that such a man is doing his duty better if he finds a position of long-continued usefulness in the country than if he forces himself into work for which he has less natural gifts, or which ensures a breakdown in health (and therefore in usefulness) within a short time.

The remaining lectures deal with the country clergyman's preaching, visiting, educational work, parochial organization, and personal influence. All are suggestive, and in all the root of the matter is rightly insisted on—that a man must know thoroughly what he undertakes to teach, and that he must feel that he has a mission to say it. Without this a clergyman's work must become mechanical, and what is not felt in the heart of the parson will not reach the heart of the people. It is only by this, accompanied by the due suppression of all *personal* assertion, that a young clergyman can surmount the great difficulty which must meet him, and on which Mr. James does not dwell sufficiently—that of appearing to teach and direct persons older than himself, and often as well educated and informed. A country clergyman has to preach to a congregation which combines gentry and rustic. He must teach the latter rather directly, and as one in authority; and it requires considerable tact or instinct of self-suppression to avoid jarring on the feelings of his

better-educated hearers. Such self-suppression comes most naturally from absorption in the work ; but we think some hints on this subject would have been useful to the future curates for whom these lectures were intended. For the rest, they contain ample hints alike on preaching, teaching, and visiting. The details of parish work, and especially of organization, must differ in different localities ; but these lectures might suggest lines of development, or points in which improvement is possible, to almost any worker in a country district.

There are, however, two very serious blots in this book which go far to make us unsay all we have said in its favour. Mr. James is not ashamed to say that he is not 'persuaded of the advisability of Daily Service' (p. 139), and 'is prepared to defend Evening Communion on Scriptural and Ecclesiastical grounds' (p. 145) ! We hope these obnoxious sentiments will be expunged in a second edition. They go far to confirm an impression which, with all their merits, these Lectures have left on our mind, that Mr. James has had no adequate grasp of Church principles.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW EDITIONS, PERIODICALS, &C.

UNDER the above heading we instinctively give the place of honour to *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1866, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury*, by H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Cambr., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, and late Ireland Professor at Oxford, fourteenth edition (London : Longmans, Green and Co., 1890). Exactly a year ago we placed at the head of our 'Brief Notes' the announcement of the thirteenth edition of these famous *Bampton Lectures*, and now we have the fourteenth before us. The title-page itself offers room for comment. In the first place we find the addition of 'LL.D. Cambridge' to the initials after Dr. Liddon's name, which thus records the honorary degree conferred upon him at Cambridge on June 10, 1890, when he was so finely described by the Public Orator (Dr. Sandys) in words which, although they have again and again been quoted, may fitly find a more abiding place in the pages of this *Review* :—

'Arcis Divinæ super muros velut speculator et custos positus, cœli præsentia quam acriter prospicit, quam fideliter denuntiat ! Talium certè virorum exemplo vatis Hebræi verba antiqua denuo vera esse facta crediderim : "Super muros tuos, Jerusalem, constitui custodes ; totâ die et totâ nocte in perpetuum non tacebunt."'

In the second place, we desiderate at the bottom of the title-page the time-honoured name of Messrs. Rivingtons, and we say this not out of any disparagement to the great house of Longmans, into which Dr. Liddon's former publishers have been merged, but because we ourselves, in common, we suspect, with all Churchmen, sorely miss the opportunity of turning into Waterloo Place, and scanning the newest theological publications, and of meeting old friends who were

drawn there for the same object as ourselves. On this ground, as on others, we bid adieu to Messrs. Rivingtons with feelings of sincere regret.

This fourteenth edition has a melancholy interest attaching to it. It contains a new Preface (on Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*) at the beginning, and a new 'Note' (on 'The Theory of Hallucination') at the end, of the volume (p. 528). This Preface and Note—it is believed—were the last pages which Dr. Liddon, amid great suffering, corrected 'for press.' The Preface confines itself to 'a single feature' of Dr. Martineau's book, viz. 'his way of dealing with the New Testament' (p. xxv). And in this connexion Dr. Liddon remarks very justly that the New Socinianism represented by Dr. Martineau differs from that, say, of Dr. Channing in two respects. 'It is nearer to the Church in its exegesis; it is much further from her in its general attitude towards the authority of the New Testament' (p. xxvi). Dr. Liddon attributes both these results to an adhesion, on the part of Dr. Martineau, to those Tübingen theories which have elsewhere been discarded under the guidance of English scholars such as Bishop Lightfoot and others. After calling attention to the 'excisions from the text of the first three Gospels which would be necessary in order to satisfy Dr. Martineau's theory that our Lord never claimed to be the Messiah,' Dr. Liddon adds in conclusion, with that consummate courtesy which was the unflinching characteristic he imparted to every controversy (see for a crucial example Note I. in the present volume)—

'The sincere and able writer before us illustrates the real connexion between the New Testament and the doctrine of Our Lord's Divinity, when, in order to get rid of the approaches to, as well as the statements of, that doctrine, he finds himself obliged to tear the writings of the Evangelists to shreds' (p. xxxi).

If we might offer a suggestion to the excellent publishers of *The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, 1890), it would be that they should either affix numbers to the volumes, or dates to the title-pages, of this admirable series. It is not always easy, without looking back, to make sure that we do not repeat. *The City of God*, by St. Augustine, 2 vols., has been reviewed at length in the present number of the *Church Quarterly Review*. Less valuable to our mind is *Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria*, by John Kaye, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln. Was this worth reprinting? On the other hand, *The Victory of Faith and other Sermons*, by Julius Charles Hare, will be welcomed by all, and if we are guilty of a *lapsus* in calling attention to it for a second time, we can only make our own the excuse of Edmund Burke when he was called to order for a false quantity.

The Divine Service in the Sixteenth Century, illustrated by the Reform of the Breviary of the Humiliati in 1548, by J. Wickham Legg, M.D., F.S.A. (from the Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society. Vol. II. London: Alabaster, Passmore and Sons,

1890), is one of the best of the many excellent papers published by the above-named Society. That it bristles with liturgical lore will surprise no one who is acquainted with Dr. Wickham Legg's labours in that field. We read with special interest his remarks on the gradual compression and suppression of the reading of Scripture in the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century, and of various other corruptions which had overtaken the Breviary at that time. The *Humiliati*, we may remark in passing, became Benedictine Canons in 1436, and their reformed Breviary appeared in 1548, the same year as our Book of Common Prayer. It was approved by Paul III., whose brief to that effect is here printed, p. 284. It will be found that the distribution of the Psalms—that most important feature of a Breviary—is by the month (as with us), not by the week. Another very remarkable circumstance is that the version both of the Psalter and the Lessons from Holy Scripture is neither the Vulgate nor the Itala. Could this have escaped the notice of Paul III. when he gave his approval? In a note on the Psalm *Deus laudum* (*al. laudem*) Dr. Wickham Legg calls in question a suggestion which has been thrown out that 'laudum' is due to a printer's error. We have no doubt whatever that the suggestion is correct. On the whole we do not hesitate to recommend this most able monograph as worthy of the most minute study. We have seldom met with anything more suggestive.

The Model of a Revised Lectionary, by the Rev. C. H. Davis, third edition (London: Elliot Stock, 1890), offers some very severe and, we cannot but add, in many cases, very just strictures on the changes made in the Revised Lectionary of 1871. He also suggests schemes or calendars of lessons for private or family reading. Some valuable hints may be gathered from this pamphlet, which must have involved great labour.

Ignorance the Danger of the Church, a Sermon preached in the Church of St. Mary the Great, Cambridge, to the University Church Society, by W. J. Butler, D.D., Dean of Lincoln (London: Rivingtons, 1890). Will Dr. Butler permit us respectfully to remind him that the class where ignorance is most dangerous, and also where it is not unfrequently found, is composed of the clergy themselves. Has he no word of counsel or rebuke for them?

The Text of the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1553, 1563, 1571, interleaved, intended chiefly for the use of students in Theological Colleges, 4to (London: Rivingtons, 1890). The Vice-Principal of the Theological College at Chichester (the Rev. W. M. Meredith)—whose initials only are modestly placed at the end of the Preface to this book—has earned the gratitude of every student of the Articles, who here has ready to his hand, in parallel columns, the successive redactions of the Thirty-Nine Articles. This is very unpretending, but very useful work, wisely undertaken and carefully executed.

The October Number of the *Newbery House Magazine* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, 1890) is as usual full of varied interest. Professor Sayce endeavours, not without success, from Babylonian monuments to establish the historical correctness of the

campaign described in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. Mr. F. Arnold has a chatty and entertaining article on the late Cardinal Newman, which tells us at least one thing we did not know before—that Dr. Latham, ‘the present head of Trinity College,’ was among ‘Newman’s staunchest opponents’ (p. 406). Dr. Macquoid continues his papers on ‘Flemish Painters,’ and Mr. Welsh his ‘Notes on the History of Books for Children.’

The October Number of the *London Diocesan Magazine* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, 1890) contains a front elevation of the southern portion of the buildings of the Church House, as designed by Sir Arthur Blomfield.

We have been much struck by a series of *Papers for Working Men*, Nos. 1–10, by the Rev. A. F. W. Ingram, head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green (London: S.P.C.K., 1890). They are full of freshness and force, due, we apprehend, to the reality of the writer.

Ought the Ober-Ommergau Passion Play to be Given Up? An Attempt to Answer the Question, by J. H. Thomas, Vicar of Hillingdon (London: Skeffington, 1890). We most cordially agree in the emphatic negative given to this question by Mr. Thomas in this very interesting account, not so much of the Play as of some of the chief performers. He will, however, find a large number who disagree with him among those who have never seen and therefore know and can know nothing about the great Passion Play.

The English Historical Review (London: Longmans, July 1890) has always such a varied *menu*, and covers such a wide area of enquiry, that almost everyone can find something to his taste. For ourselves, we should single out the Article by Mr. Parker on the ‘Seven Liberal Arts.’ Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole brings to a conclusion his Memoir of Sir Richard Church, the great champion of Greece in her War of Independence.

In the last issue of the *Indian Church Quarterly Review* (Calcutta and London: Fisher Unwin, 1890) the Bishop of Bombay embarks on an enquiry into the ‘Liturgies of the Anglican Communion,’ which will interest our readers. There is also a paper by Father Benson on ‘The Divine Purpose and Inspiration of the Christian Scriptures’ (*to be continued*). Amid much that is obscure there is much to attract. We have been struck with a paper by Mr. Oscar D. Watkins on the ‘Divine Laws of Marriage,’ which concludes with a survey of the laws of Divorce. The variety of recognized practice may well be called ‘appalling.’

The Theological Monthly for October (London: Nisbet and Co., 1890) contains the third part of ‘Wellhausen on the Pentateuch,’ by the Rev. J. J. Lias, which deserves close attention. The same may be said of *The Methods of the ‘Higher Criticism,’ illustrated in an Examination of Dr. Pfleiderer’s Theory as to the Resurrection*, by W. P. Dickson, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Glasgow (Glasgow: Maclehoose, 1890). If anything can be more astounding than the audacity of assertion which meets us now and again in the walks of the ‘Higher Criticism,’ it is the adhesion it secures in quarters where you would least expect it.

Many of our readers will share the pleasure we have in announcing that a Society or Printing Club is in course of formation, which it is suggested should be called the 'Henry Bradshaw Liturgical Text Society,' and should have for its object 'the reprinting of liturgical manuscripts or rare editions, preference being given to those which bear upon the history of the Book of Common Prayer or of the Church of England, or which are of intrinsic liturgical interest.' This Society will undertake the following classes of editions:— 'I. Books of English Mediæval Uses. II. Books of English Uses before the Conquest. III. Celtic Service Books. IV. The Early and Mediæval Western Uses, including the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Service Books. V. English Occasional Services. VI. Early Reformed German *Agenda*.' It is proposed that the Society be limited for the present to 250 members, and that the works edited by the Society be not published. The annual subscription of each member to be one guinea, in return for which he will receive the publications of the Society without further payment. One volume at least to be issued every year. We trust this spirited undertaking will meet with the support it deserves. We have before us a list of those who have intimated their intention of joining the Society. As might be expected, the list contains not a few dignitaries of the Church. Their *titles* in each case are given, but the *names* are withheld. Now the 'Very Rev. the Dean of Carlisle' signifies nothing in particular, but the 'Very Rev. W. G. Henderson, Dean of Carlisle,' reminds us at once of one of the most distinguished labourers in the field which this Society hopes to cultivate. We consider this omission of the name a great mistake. This remark admits of a more extensive application.

A different, and perhaps a wider, circle of readers will be interested in learning that in January 1891 will be issued a New Series of our old friend—forty-years-old friend—*The Monthly Packet*, edited by Charlotte M. Yonge and Christabel Coleridge. Church-folk of both sexes can only hope that the New Series may prove as valuable and as helpful as the old.
